

VOL. XXVIII.—No. 3.—Whole No. 310.

Price, \$3.00 a Year.

THE
American Church
REVIEW.

JULY, 1876.

NEW YORK:
NO. 7 COOPER UNION.
LONDON, TRÜBNER & CO.
1876.

DAILY ADVERTISER PRINTING HOUSE, NEWARK, N.J.

THE AMERICAN CHURCH REVIEW.

Rev. EDWARD B. BOGGS, D. D.,

Editor and Proprietor.

JULY, 1876.

ART.	PAGE.
I.—THE RECIPROCAL INFLUENCE OF CHRISTIANITY AND LIBERTY.—Rev. D. R. Goodwin, D.D., Philadelphia.	321
II.—LATIN HYMNODY, NO. III.—Rev. John Anketell, New York.	340
III.—BISHOP JOHNS.—Rev. Joseph Packard, D.D., Theological Seminary, Virginia.	353
IV.—THE SECOND REUNION CONFERENCE AT BONN, 1875.—Rev. William Stevens Perry D.D., Geneva N. Y.	368
V.—NEALE AND LITTLEDALE ON THE PSALMS.—Rev. John Henry Hopkins, D.D., Plattsburgh, N. Y.	388
VI.—QUESTION OF IMMORTALITY.—Rev. F. A. Henry, Newark, N. J.	410
VII.—THE VOYAGE OF VERRAZANO.—Rev. B. F. DeCosta, New York.	427
VIII.—THE EARLY CHURCH IN AMERICA, ESPECIALLY IN NORTH CAROLINA.—Rev. Jarvis Buxton, D.D., Asheville, N. C.	445
IX.—CENTENNIAL THOUGHTS—Rev. Wallace Carnahan, San Marcos, Texas.	461
X.—BOOK NOTICES.—COLET'S LETTERS—MOZLEY'S SERMONS—CHURCH CONGRESS, 1875—PRIVATE JUDGMENT AND CHURCH AUTHORITY—THE SABBATH OF THE FIELDS—THE GREEKS AND PERSIANS—RUDIMENTS OF THEOLOGY—ECCLESIASTICAL JUDGMENTS BY DR. PHILLIMORE—SHINN'S CHURCH HISTORY—BONN CONFERENCE, 1875—PLATO'S BEST THOUGHTS—NORMAN MACLEOD, etc.	467

STANDING NOTICES.

THE AMERICAN CHURCH REVIEW is published on the first of January, April, July, and October.

TERMS.—The subscription is \$3.00 per volume in advance, Missionaries \$3.00. No subscriptions received for less than one volume.

REMITTANCES.—Subscriptions now due, should be sent by Check or P. O. Order, payable to the order of EDWARD B. BOGGS. If a receipt is desired, a stamp should be enclosed.

CHANGE OF ADDRESS.—Subscribers in changing their Post Office Address, will please give notice at this office, or we cannot be responsible for the loss of their numbers.

DISCONTINUANCES.—It is a standing rule of this Office to send the Review to those subscribers who do not give notice of discontinuance previous to the commencement of a new volume. And even when due notice is given, the Magazine will not be discontinued until all arrears are paid, unless at the option of the Proprietor.

COMMUNICATIONS.—All communications should be addressed "Editor AMERICAN CHURCH REVIEW, Newark, N. J., or 7 Cooper Union, New York City."

AMERICAN CHURCH REVIEW.

VOL. XXVIII.—JULY, 1876.

THE RECIPROCAL INFLUENCE OF CHRISTIANITY AND LIBERTY.

By Christianity we understand, no ecclesiastical hierarchy or organization; but the religion instituted by Christ, promulgated by his Apostles, set forth in the Holy Scriptures, propagated and preserved in the world by the preaching of the Gospel and the power of the Holy Ghost. By liberty we understand, neither lawlessness nor license in Church or State. While the end of civil government is to secure that order which is necessary to the largest attainable measure of free activity for all, the end of civil liberty is self-government; and it implies that the civil government should give to every man as full an opportunity for attaining and enjoying that end as the rights of others and the good of all will admit. Civil liberty may exist under any form of civil government, but it seems plain that it is best secured when a popular constitution can be permanently and quietly maintained. Religious liberty is neither Cæsarism, nor secularism, nor individualism, nor indifferentism. It does not abate one jot of the claims, the

absolute claims, of God and His truth; but it leaves those claims to be addressed to the mind and heart and conscience of every man, not to his bodily sensibilities or to his temporal interests. It relies upon moral and spiritual influence, not upon physical force. It is consistent with the profession and maintenance of the most minute and prolix creed, but is most fully enjoyed where the symbols of communion, retaining all that is essential and fundamental to true religion, are the most comprehensive and simple.

Christ's religion was embodied in Himself, in His character and work and teaching. Who, then, was He, and what did he teach? The Son of God was born in a stable, and died on the cross. He was known by His neighbors as the carpenter and the carpenter's son. His daily life was among the poor and the lowly. He gathered a company of fishermen as His bosom friends in His earthly ministry, and took a penitent thief as His companion to Paradise. He taught that the poor shall possess the kingdom of Heaven, and the meek shall inherit the earth; that God watches over the humblest of His children with more than paternal care, that the angels who always behold the face of the Father minister to them, and that woe is to him who despises them. "The princes of the Gentiles," said He, "exercise lordship over them, and their great ones exercise authority upon them; but so shall it not be among you; but whosoever will be great among you shall be your minister, and whosoever of you will be the chiefest shall be servant of all." So much for His followers among themselves. To them He directs all His precepts—not to kings, or rulers, or magistrates, or any in authority; and should His followers be called to discharge such functions, He has left the spirit of these same precepts, and these only, to guide them. Yet, He never utters a word to make the poor discontented or turbulent, to render them jealous or envious of the rich and great; or hostile to them, or ambitious to reach their places. He never says a syllable to stir up a spirit of sedition against the constituted government, even though it was the iron despotism of Rome. His command is "Render to Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's," as well as "to God the things that are God's." But it must be remembered that Cæsar and his deputies and officials, and all the

machinery of the Roman government then lay, and were regarded as lying, beyond the bounds of His Kingdom—that kingdom of the truth for which He was giving laws. To His kingdom that government as a system was a foreign element.

The Apostles renew and re-echo the teachings of their master. They declare that God is no respecter of persons, but that whatsoever any man doeth the same shall he receive from the Lord, whether he be bond or free. They teach that all Christians are brethren, as children of a common Father and redeemed by a common Saviour, and that by love they should serve one another. It is the man, and not his accidents, that fills their view; the soul for which Christ died, and not its external circumstances of worldly dignity or of worldly insignificance, that measures their interest and regard. “Let the poor,” says St. James, “rejoice in that he is exalted; but the rich in that he is made low;” and he emphatically condemns the contemptuous treatment of “the poor man in vile raiment.” “Ye see your calling, brethren,” says St. Paul, “how that not many wise men after the flesh, not many mighty, not many noble, are called;” “we are all one in Christ Jesus; where there is neither Greek nor Jew, Barbarian, Seythian, bond nor free, but Christ is all and in all.”

Yet the Apostles, after the example of their Master, taught distinctly that “every soul should be subject to the higher powers,” to the lawful government; that Christians should submit to every ordinance of man for the Lord’s sake; as free and not using their liberty for a cloak of maliciousness, but as the servants of God.” They taught, too, that there should be order and government in the Church itself; that we are members in one body, and that all members have not the same office. But it is to be observed, that, though “God hath set in the Church *first* the Apostles,” yet St. Paul says, for himself and his colleagues in that office, “We preach not ourselves, but Christ Jesus, the Lord, and ourselves your servants for Jesus’ sake;” “not for that we have dominion over your faith, but are helpers of your joy.” And St. Peter exhorts presbyters, as being himself their fellow-presbyter, to conduct themselves “not as lords over God’s heritage, but as examples to the flock.” Indeed, the ministers of God were approved *as such* by special toils and privations, abuse and contempt, “for, I

think," says St. Paul, " that God hath set forth us, the Apostles, last, as it were appointed unto death; for we are made a spectacle to the world and to angels and to men; even unto the present hour we both hunger and thirst, and are naked and are buffeted, and have no certain dwelling place, and labor working with our own hands; being reviled we bless, being persecuted we suffer it; being defamed we entreat; we are made as the filth of the world and are the offscouring of all things unto this day." Such was the highest dignity to which men were called in the Apostolic Church.

Such was the religion which Christ and His Apostles established. So far as the influence and spirit of such a religion should leaven human society, how is it possible that it should fail to promote liberty, brotherhood and equality among men; to develop manhood, to relieve the oppressed, to elevate the degraded, to humble the proud, to restrain the selfishness of ambition, to temper the exercise of authority, to check the insolence of power and the domineering of despotism; and to make both the high and the low unspeakably happier, according to the noble sentiment of St. James, in their mutual approximation! Christianity lays the only secure foundation for permanent civil liberty. It is utterly unlike any mere doctrine of the rights of man. It inculcates duties rather than rights. By its doctrine and spirit of meek humility and brotherly love, it is quite as inconsistent with the coarse and violent and insolent demands of a reckless mob as it is with the cool and cruel and cunning policy of an aristocracy or the ruthless despotism of an autocrat. Christianity alone effectually represses that spirit of human pride and selfishness which tends alike to crush and to undermine the rising fabric of civil freedom. Christianity is popular without being revolutionary; submissive to wrong, but not conservative of evil. Doubtless, as there always have been, so there always will be, in every community, men of inferior mental capacity and moral character; but while these may need to be, in various degrees, guided and restrained, Christianity forbids that they should ever be trampled upon or used merely as means for the elevation or aggrandisement of others. Christianity teaches us to support the weak, and not to make them support us; to love them as brethren,

to be pitiful, to be courteous, honestly to desire that our inferiors should become our equals, to respect their humanity, and to seek by all possible means their speediest elevation and improvement. Christianity is hopeful. She does not despair of the elevation of the masses of mankind or give them up to a hopeless and interminable degradation. "But they are mere children," it is said. Be it so, and she would have us treat them as children. But children are guided and governed, not that the parents may enjoy the honor and dignity of governing, not that their despotic spirit may be justified, not that their wealth and consideration may be increased, not that they may live at their ease on the labors of their children, not that their parental sway may be perpetuated, but always with the express hope and aim that those children may soon learn to guide and govern themselves, and eventually to guide and govern others in their turn. Such, Christianity would teach, should be the treatment of all inferior classes in society. The highest ideal of the Christian state, is, "a government of the people, by the people, for the people."

When we pass from theory to fact and inquire of history what has been the actual influence of Christianity upon civil liberty and civil life, it is necessary to remember that this divine religion exerts its influence through human agencies and organs, and that its proper effects are liable to be modified or obstructed, and even perverted or annulled by the imperfection or reaction of the medium through which it is transmitted. This religion is pure only at its source, and it is only by constantly recurring to that source that its lost purity is to be restored. Let us be thankful that in the Holy Scriptures we have the means of thus revisiting that source and making fresh drafts from the pure waters of life and truth. Indeed, it is one of the most striking proofs of the truth and divinity of the Christian religion, that, though, in the progress of enlightenment and knowledge we may reach higher and larger views of divine and spiritual things and of the economy of the Kingdom of God than those of Jerome or Origen, or Tertullian, of either of the Gregories or Clements, or of Irenaeus or Ignatius, and may have a more thorough and critical knowledge of the meaning and the doctrine of the Scrip-

tures than the most learned and excellent of the early Fathers possessed, yet we can never get above or beyond, nay, we can never attain to the full height and depth and length and breadth of the original doctrine of Christ and His Apostles. As our minds and knowledge, our science and culture expand, we only come to understand that doctrine better, and at the same time to apprehend more distinctly its unfathomable riches, its unapproachable, super-human character. Assuredly Jesus Christ and His religion are not a product of the development of humanity, but come into that development from a higher source. It is true they did not come into the world by chance. No one who recognizes a universal plan of Divine government in the world, who discerns in history the unfolding scheme of a wise and holy Providence, can fail to see that a preparation was made for the coming of Christ, not only in the Jewish history and economy, but in the language and literature, the philosophy and polity, the civilization, culture and conquests of the Greeks and Romans. Christ came in the fulness of the times. In Him a Divine element was brought into immediate contact, into permanent and visible conjunction with human history. But this divine element thus entering into the evolution of humanity, the historical results must be determined by the action and reaction of the divine and the human elements upon each other; and whatever may have been the Providential preparation for this influx of the Divine, there still remained on the human side manifold oppositions and obstructions to be overcome and surmounted.

Christianity had to cope with the narrow and groveling prejudices of Judaism, with the desperate scepticism, the proud and perverse disputation of Greek philosophy, with the brutal violence and iron vigor of Roman despotism, and with the rank licentiousness and leprous vices of a corrupt and decaying society. Even before the decease of the Apostles the results of the reaction of these human elements, the leaven of human corruption began to show themselves, at Jerusalem, at Antioch, Corinth, Rome, among the Galatians, among those to whom St. Peter and St. Jude wrote their epistles, and in the seven churches of Asia. After the death of the Apostles there followed a rank luxuriance of strange doctrines, a very Babel of monstrous heresies, through

which the truth of the Gospel owed its preservation, humanly speaking, to two things, the pressure of persecution and the faithful care of the governors of the church. But the very prestige of the services of these latter, such is the weakness of human nature, led to their corruption and degeneracy, to a vast expansion of the pretensions and power of the hierarchy—an evil, in its consequences, almost as great as that which had just been escaped. And, again, when the persecution ceased, upon the conversion of Constantine, the corrupting worldly element only gained a firmer foothold in the Church. Hierarchy and people, clergy and laity alike fell under the control of the imperial power, no longer an external force assailing the Church from without, but wielding its domination within with an insidious and irresistible sway. The Bishops of the Church and the very doctrines of religion became the footballs of court intrigue. Notwithstanding all this, no impartial student of history can fail to acknowledge that the spirit of Christianity wrought many social reforms and ameliorations; but it is not to be wondered at, that, under such circumstances, it could not produce all the beneficent effects of its proper character. With the decline and fall of the Roman Empire, Christianity, in the West, was driven to take up its home among the hordes of barbarian invaders. Such was the new stock on which it must be engrafted, such the mass of ignorance and violence it had to leaven, of such rough and uncouth materials it had to reconstruct the Christian Church. Of course the practical result was modified by the character of these materials. As the imperial power declined and was withdrawn, that of the hierarchy increased, until the Papal domination, with all its pestilent corruptions and its secularization of the Kingdom of God, was established throughout Europe. Coming off victorious from its struggle with the bastard empire of the West, allying itself with the spirit of the feudal system, it proudly trampled under foot the temporal sovereignty, and, with a blasphemous assumption of the attributes of Deity, it ruled over the kings of the earth. Truly, if there were not in our holy religion, an indestructible power and life, it would have been at length crushed out of existence, under such a load of corruptions and perversions, varied and multiplied and accumulated from age to age. But instead of that, the spirit of

Christianity roused itself at last to throw off with one mighty effort the crushing incubus—and then came the glorious Reformation. Yet, even here, there appeared the perversion of an encroaching human element. The character of this heavenly religion was not manifested in its purity, for, as was natural, in resisting the corrupt domination of the Romish hierarchy, too close and too subservient an alliance was made with the civil power. This has been the great drawback upon the full working out of the proper influence of Christianity under the Protestant Reformation. Still, with this drawback here, and the vastly greater drawbacks elsewhere, the grand result as to the actual influence of Christianity upon civil liberty, is this: that under its influence, and under that alone, has civil liberty ever anywhere in the world been enjoyed by whole communities; nowhere else have purely popular governments been established with permanent success. The ancient republics were really oligarchies, the mass of their population being slaves, or, at least, destitute of the rights of citizenship; they were based upon force; they subsisted upon war, piracy and plunder; and the freest of them were always in an uncertain and fluctuating condition. Under the influence of their religion, all modern Christian governments, of whatever form, repose, in a greater or less degree, upon a free and enlightened public opinion as their basis, and make it avowedly their great object to promote the general good and advancement of the people by the arts of peace. Under the influence of Christianity alone have castes and classes disappeared, and the dignity, the moral claims and inherent rights of man *as man*, been acknowledged. Under her influence alone have slavery and serfdom been abolished. But, in the working out of this abolition, we have especially to note that it has been the latent spirit of our divine religion, and not the ecclesiastical hierarchy—the spirit of that religion, often, in spite of the hierarchy, which usually allies itself with the aristocratic tendencies—the spirit of that religion working up from the general Christian heart, that has accomplished the grand result. Christianity is manifestly not of the earth, not a mere natural result of human progress, but a factor and a force introduced from above. Men lived for ages in the same latitudes and longitudes which are now the seat of Christendom, in the same climates,

under the same general physical conditions; yet, without Christianity they never worked out these results. Men still live under similar favorable external conditions in Japan, for example, and yet they do not reach these results. To make Jesus Christ, as Mr. Buckle would do, a mere product of His times, and the Christian religion a mere result of the natural evolution of mankind under the given external circumstances; to deny to it the credit of having sensibly affected the production of the modern culture and freedom which distinguishes Christendom, or, indeed, the production of any good whatever; and yet to labor through whole volumes in a systematic effort to heap upon it the odium of having caused most of the evils and created most of the obstacles that modern civilization has had to encounter, is one of the most astonishing specimens of perversion of sentiment, distortion of facts, and sophistry of reasoning, to be found in the whole compass of modern literature.

As to the effect of Christianity upon *religious* liberty, it is manifest that the persecutions which disgraced its history during the middle ages, and for a long time after, among Protestants, even, as well as among Romanists, find not the slightest foundation or sanction in the character or teaching of Christ or His Apostles. Our Lord knew that His religion would be exposed to the malignant persecutions of Jews and Gentiles; He often foretold it, and warned His disciples to be prepared for it; but He never suggested a retort. The contrary was the precise characteristic of His whole spirit and doctrine. The Apostles met the persecutions which had been predicted, but they never had the most distant thought of retaliation. Of course, discipline was exercised within their own flocks, but it was spiritual discipline by spiritual methods, never with the use of physical force, which in those times they could not have used if they would, and would not if they could. Among St. Paul's many journeyings after his conversion we hear of none undertaken on any mission like that upon which he was stricken down on the way to Damascus. For the schismatic or the heretic, as well as for the evil liver, the highest punishment was the being cut off from the communion of the faithful. The right of expelling refractory members must be inherent in every society, and is perfectly consistent with the

truest conception of religious liberty. The upbraidings of conscience and the fear of God's future judgments are perfectly consistent with religious liberty. The question of moral right and the reality of the Divine threatening is a question of truth or fact, and not a matter of religious liberty. But there is not in all the life and teaching of Christ or His Apostles the slightest hint of punishing misbelieving or misbehaving brethren with torture and imprisonment, the faggot and the stake, or the cool, diabolical faree of delivering them over to the secular arm for the execution of such inflictions. It is true the faithful are forbidden by the Apostle to keep company with an excommunicated person, even so much as to eat and our Lord Himself had said, "let him be unto thee as a heathen man and a publican." But it must be remembered that, when those rules were given, their application would not expose the party offending to any physical suffering or hardship, and certainly it was not intended that they should; it was not intended that a man should be forced to believe the truth in order to avoid being starved to death. And if, in subsequent times the application of these rules led or would lead to great physical privation, to cold and nakedness and famishing and death, then, their literal execution was as gross a perversion of Scripture as Satan himself could have suggested. The coarsest Infidelity has been guilty of no greater blasphemy. Let us be thankful that the spirit of Christianity has thrown off the incrustations of ages of corruption, and brought a large part of Christendom to the distinct consciousness, to the full and hearty acceptance of religious liberty. It is true that intolerance and the duty of persecution are still preached in some quarters, and the infallible, unchangeable Church of the Middle Ages must persevere continue to preach it and practice it as far as her crafty estimate of expediency and present safety will permit. But for such assailants of religious liberty to attempt to brand the object of their attacks as heathenish indifferentism, is a proof either of great obtuseness of perception or of a conscious perversion of truth for the sake of a plausible argument.

Religious liberty does not hinder the Church from effectually insisting upon the preservation of pure doctrine in her bosom. But her doctrine is addressed to the minds and consciences of

men, under the motives presented by sound reason and Divine authority, and not those drawn from the Inquisition and the Auto-da-fé. Every man has a right to accept her doctrine or to reject it—not an absolute right, for no man has such a right to reject any truth or to maintain any falsehood—but a relative right, *i. e.*, the Church has no right, and her Founder never intended that she should exercise or claim the right, forcibly to compel acquiescence. Christianity fully recognizes man's mental and moral freedom, and his personal accountability to God for the exercise of that freedom. She may say with Christ, you must believe or be damned; but she may not say with Charlemagne, you must be baptised or be drowned. God has revealed His mercy that we too might learn to be merciful; He has so revealed His vengeance that we might learn to refrain from its exercise. [Rom. xii: 19.]

In short, persecution originated in human corruption, not in Christian principle; in human passion and self-will, or at best in the mistaken judgment of human infirmity, not in the spirit or teaching of Jesus Christ. It was not introduced into the world by Christianity, but has been engrafted upon it by the spirit of the world in days of darkness and violence and hierarchical domination. It is manifestly inimical to the interests of true religion. It engenders and encourages hypocrisy, or stolid ignorance, or the abnegation of thought and reason and personal accountability; and thus tends to destroy proper, personal, rational faith, the faith of a reasonable man, the faith that leads to a reasonable service. True faith and true religion absolutely presuppose a free action of the mind and will of man. No other religion has so fully recognized this fact as Christianity; and a return to the principles of religious freedom is but a return to the first principles of Christ's religion, the disentanglement, after ages of perversion and corruption, of its true spirit and proper influence.

Now it is but an identical proposition to say that wherever the tendencies of Christianity have the freest scope, and its proper results most thoroughly worked out, there Christianity will exist in its most complete and characteristic form. And every stage of progress towards such a consummation must be so much vantage ground for further advancement. If Christianity tends to promote civil liberty, or naturally to coalesce with it, then the exist-

ence of civil liberty must react advantageously upon Christianity. They must be mutual friends; and that though each may have many other friends besides. There may be many other influences favorable to civil liberty besides Christianity—and among them may even be some of an utterly irreligious and anti-Christian character—as, on the other hand, there certainly are many influences favorable to Christianity besides civil liberty. The same is true of the relation of Christianity to general light and knowledge, to civilization and social culture. It is among its divine credentials that it falls in and harmonizes with whatever tends to the elevation and happiness of man, or to the unfolding and enlargement of his powers, to the perfecting of humanity in any of its aspects or relations. Christianity has its proper spiritual purpose, which is no other than to lead man on to the attainment and accomplishment of the highest end of his being, in his relation to what is above and beyond this present world. But notwithstanding this, or, rather, precisely because of this, it is in conscious harmony with all that is true and beautiful and good, with all that is pure and honest and virtuous, with all that is lovely and noble and manly. The more perfectly man is developed as man, in all his normal faculties and relations, the better vehicle he becomes for the manifestation of the full power and glory of the Christian religion. Such a development, from whatever causes proceeding, is, humanly speaking, a preparation for Christianity; for if this religion comes to raise the fallen, to elevate the degraded, to guide the erring, to enlighten the dark, to ennable the mean, to reform the vicious, she cannot but welcome whatever will help her in her benign mission. But light and liberty and love cannot but help her. Christ did, indeed, once say, "he that is not with Me is against Me;" but it was of Satan He then spoke. Again He said, "he that is not against us is on our part," and then it was of well-intentioned but partially enlightened men He spoke.

It is true, man's nature is radically perverted, and the best things may, by abuse, become the worst. Without the aid of Divine grace, without an influence from on high, without the leaven of Christ's religion, man can never reach his highest development in relation either to the future world or to this. Every

right and good tendency in him, is, in its normal evolution, ready to welcome and embrace Christianity. Scientific superciliousness and philosophic pride and prejudice are no part of man's true development. But though the evil of man's nature crops out everywhere, yet, on the whole, intellectual light and culture are more favorable to Christianity than brutish darkness and ignorance. Ignorance may be the mother of superstitious devotion, but knowledge is the foster parent of true religion. Christianity does not fear knowledge or frown upon it ; rather she both commends and commands it. "Be not children in understanding," is her injunction, "howbeit, in malice be ye children, but in understanding be men;" *be men—men* is what Christianity wants ; not ignorant children, but intelligent men. Every soul may be, in the sight of God, equally precious, yet the conversion of one St. Paul was of more consequence to the advancement of the Christian religion—such are the law and movement of Divine Providence—than the gathering in of whole masses of ignorant heathen at Laodicea, at Sardis, or even at Rome. And, as civil liberty must naturally help to produce, in a given community, a greater number of men, of real, intelligent, *manly* men, it cannot fail to exert a favorable reflex influence upon the promotion both of the truth and of the power of Christianity. Moreover, civil liberty must give Christianity a freer scope for exerting and diffusing its own benign influence.

We have but to glance at the history and geography of Christendom to find this view abundantly confirmed by facts. We shall find that whenever and wherever civil liberty has become quietly and permanently established, then and there has Christianity had its purest and noblest realization, has exerted most widely its transforming spiritual influence ; in Germany, in Holland, in Switzerland, in England and Scotland, in America, in France. The old French Revolution is often thrown back upon us as settling the whole question against us ; but it is strangely or studiously forgotten that all the horrors of that revolution and all its atheistic orgies resulted not from civil liberty, but were the natural and necessary fruit of the preceding ages of civil and religious despotism, of grinding and intolerable oppression. The Atheism and the spirit of license already existed ; they caused the

evils of the revolution, and were not its effects. Voltaire had already come upon the scene, and had completed his career. Meantime, so far as civil liberty has resulted from that revolution, even though Atheism may have had a hand in producing it—for God often brings good out of evil—it has been an inestimable blessing to France and to Europe. Our greatest temporal benefits commonly proceed from a variety of causes; and it is sometimes through the crisis of a violent and dangerous disease that the system is most thoroughly purified and invigorated. Had not men perversely insisted upon associating the idea of infidelity with the spirit of liberty, on the one hand, and, on the other hand, had not quite too much of the old religious and civil despotism been retained and restored in the conservative reaction, the blessing resulting from that revolution had been greater still. But, after all, at this present moment, is there not vastly more of intelligent practical Christianity in Hungary than in Austria, in France than in Spain or Italy or in any country of Europe where civil liberty has always, or until recently, been suppressed? Those professed friends of Christianity, who, in the fanatical zeal of blind conservatism, insist upon associating civil liberty with infidelity and Atheism, and Christianity with despotisms and oligarchies, inflict upon the cause of true religion a sorcer wound than could ever have been inflicted by Infidelity and Atheism themselves. They furnish Infidelity and Atheism with their most effective weapons; they put the greatest stumbling-block in the way of religion; they make zealous Infidels and Atheists of thousands who would otherwise, by God's grace, be as zealous Christians. The lovers of freedom will be Infidels, because Christians will be lovers of absolutism, defenders of slavery, and advocates of caste.

That religious liberty reacts advantageously on Christianity needs no further argument but the simple appeal to history and facts. The religious despotism of Roman Catholic countries serves merely to keep out the light and truth which might lead to a reformation of old and festering corruptions; and to educate, or rather to leave uneducated, masses of men semi-atheistic, semi-heathen, superstitiously devout but morally and intellectually weak and childish. And in Protestant countries religious intoler-

ance has uniformly resulted in dwarfing and paralyzing the religion it was designed to protect. This is abundantly illustrated in the religious history of England and of America. Intolerance has always been followed by religious declension and doctrinal superficiality. To pass at once to the present time, compare the energetic, intelligent, aggressive spirit of Protestantism in England, or Switzerland, or America, with the cold and lifeless state of the same religion in Denmark and Sweden. Error, corruption, conscious weakness may be intolerant; but truth needs no such protection; she rejoices in her own strength and in her perfect adaptation to man's nature and wants. She does not treat man as a maniac who must be laced in a strait jacket in order to be kept in the true religion.

Had Christianity needed the protection of an intolerant religious despotism, what would have become of her in the earliest and purest periods of her history, when all the powers of the world, both civil and religious, were arrayed in deadly hostility against her. And how can she now hope to subdue the world which still lies in wickedness, to prevail over the Brahminism, and Buddhism, and Confucianism which hold possession of India and China and Japan, containing about half the population of the globe? When she asks of the Chinese and Japanese a free entrance among them, shall she plainly tell them that so soon as she gets the upperhand there she will strip of their goods and banish from their homes, or consign to prison, torture and death, all who refuse to receive her teaching and conform to her rites. Surely, if she prefers her petition with such an intention, she ought in honesty and fairness to announce it beforehand. In no such spirit did Jesus and His Apostles preach the Gospel of the Kingdom of God; in no such spirit did He open His great commission in the synagogue at Nazareth; and in no such spirit is the world to be subdued to His obedience. When James and John would have called down fire from Heaven to consume those who refused to receive Him, He meekly rebuked them, saying, "ye know not what manner of spirit ye are of, for the Son of Man is not come to destroy men's lives, but to save them." Christianity is not to convert men as Charlemagne converted the Saxons and Philip II the Moriscoes; her festivals are no longer to be St. Bartholomew's

Eves¹ and Sicilian Vespers; her Easters are not to be made more joyous and solemn by holocausts of hundreds of human beings in Auto-da-fés; her heroes and champions are not to be Torquemadas and Philips, and Bloody Marys, and Dukes of Alva; her tender mercies are not to be exhibited in Albigensian and Waldensian crusades, in Dutch massacres, in Huguenot expatriations, in Inquisitorial tortures and Smithfield fires. No; turning away from such scenes, let us listen to the words of Jesus: "Come unto Me all ye that labor, and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest; take My yoke upon you and learn of Me, for I am meek and lowly in heart; and ye shall find rest unto your souls." And hear the Apostle, saying, "by the gentleness and meekness of Christ, I beseech you." Such is the spirit in which Christianity is to go forth to her future and final victories. Such is the spirit in which she is to grapple with the free thought and the free and vigorous activities of the present and the coming age. The weapons of her warfare are not carnal, but mighty through God to the pulling down of strongholds. Civil and religious freedom are the conditions of her real and complete success. Yet how slow has she been to learn this lesson, a lesson lying among the first principles of the doctrine and spirit of her Divine Founder! or, rather, to unlearn that other lesson which the hierarchial perverters of that spirit and doctrine had been busy for ages in inculcating. The instances of persecution to which allusion has just been made, are all chargeable to Roman Catholics; but it is not intended to be denied or concealed that instances, many instances, of similar persecutions are not wanting on the Protestant side. The others alone have been signalized for two reasons: (1) The early Protestants in this respect did but inconsiderately and blindly copy the example of their Romish brethren and predecessors. The right and the duty of persecution had been preached and prac-

¹ It is little to the purpose to apologise for the Pope—the infallible Pope—who ordered a Te Deum to be sung upon hearing of this massacre, by saying that probably he had been misinformed in regard to the nature of the facts. Had his infallibility expressly made the apology *for himself* when he was better informed, the case might be otherwise. Did he ever make it? The apology from any other party is neither authoritative nor conclusive.

ticed all along, as a thing of course—it was an inveterate prejudice—an heirloom received from the maternal home. To preach and practice it was felt to be necessary in order to substantiate a claim to earnest faith and piety. Later developments have shown the true spirit of the two systems. There may have been individual instances of toleration on the side of Romanists—not of *Rome*—just as there may have been individual instances of persecution on the side of Protestants. Lord Baltimore may have established universal toleration in his colony of Maryland,¹ while Calvin burnt Servetus, and the Puritans maltreated the Quakers. Far be it from us to think that there have been no good men in the Church of Rome. She has had in her bosom a Fenelon and a Xavier and some of the noblest saints that ever lived; but it is a striking and significant fact that many of those whom she has canonized after they were dead she persecuted and harassed unmercifully while they were living. They were saints in spite of her system and in spite of her ruling powers. On the other hand, there have undoubtedly been very bad men among Protestants, even among those of great pretensions to religion and piety. But they have been such in spite of the system which should have made them better. In like manner, heathenism has had its Socrates, its Regulus, its Lucretia and its Cæsar Marcus Antoninus; whilst Christianity has had her John xxiii, her Alexander vi, her Caesar Borgia, her other Lucretia, her Richard ii, her Charles ii, her Catharine ii, her Benedict Arnold and her George iv. But a system must be judged by its general results and revealed tendencies and not by sporadic and exceptional cases. (2) We have cited instances of Romish persecution exclusively, because those instances have been in degree and character incomparably more flagrant, cruel, horrible, systematic and persistent than those which can be alleged on the other side; and they have never been disowned or condemned by any Papal bull or syllabus or encyclical letter; but rather have been implicitly or expressly applauded and approved by the highest authorities of the Roman Church to the present day, and sanctioned in their principle by

¹ And yet it appears from a careful examination of the history of the time that this was done not from choice, but because it could not be helped.

the express definitions of the present infallible Pope himself. But to the credit of Protestantism it may now be said, that, whatever may have been its incidental shortcomings in the past, it has generally learned at length, in a greater or less degree, the simple apostolic and Christian lesson of *religious freedom*.

By religious freedom we mean that there should be, under the law of the land, freedom of thought, of speech and of the press, for all kinds and modes of religion, including not only all denominations of Christians but Judaism, Mahometanism, Paganism, Pantheism and Atheism. Of course the State may have its own religion, while it tolerates all others; and malicious blasphemy, or immoral practices, or foul and reckless assaults upon Christianity, however they may seek to clothe themselves in the guise of religion, may be restrained by law as being offensive to the moral sense and the well-being of the community. Precisely at this point nice questions may be raised; and here, as in all complex practical matters, it may be difficult so to frame the rule as definitely to provide for all real or supposable cases. But the *principle* should be, *universal religious freedom*. Some may think so broad a toleration inconsistent with earnest loyalty to Christian truth. But suppose Christ to have told the Scribes and Pharisees, and Herod and Pilate, that He proposed, as soon as He and His followers should be able so to do, to put them all down by force and crush them with a strong hand! (But then what of the "more than twelve legions of angels?") And suppose Peter to have told Simon Magus that, if the law allowed it, he would send him forthwith to torture and the flames; or Paul to have told the magistrates at Phillipi that, if he had the power, he would scourge *them*, and, instead of thrusting their feet into the stocks, would bind them to the stake and burn them upon the spot; or to have announced to the Athenians on Mars' hill, that, as soon as the Christians should grow strong enough, they would drive them out of their temples, throw down their altars, and compel them to worship in Christian Churches, or strip them of their goods and banish or immolate them all!

No; Cortez and Pizarro are not the representatives of the Apostles, nor the models of Christian missionaries. Such was not the spirit in which the Gospel was preached at the first, and such

ought not to be the spirit in which it is to be professed and propagated now. Surely, it has greater advantages for preserving itself and making progress now, than it had then. If it succeeded then without the protection and aid of intolerance, still more may it succeed without such aid and protection now; for it will hardly be suggested that the fires of intolerance are intended by Divine Providence as the appropriate modern substitute for the primitive miracles; or, that what the suffering of persecution did for the purity of the early Church the exercise of persecution is to accomplish for the later Church.

Christianity needs only a fair and open field; with really earnest and faithful adherents, who believe in their Lord with all their hearts, who love His blessed name as St. Paul loved it, and who love the souls of men even as He loved them who died for their redemption. Going forth in such a spirit, there is no danger of defeat, no doubt of success. Our help is in the name of the Lord; and a strong tower is our God. Our hope and confidence are in the truth, in the presence of Christ, and in the power of the Holy Ghost.

DANIEL R. GOODWIN.

L A T I N H Y M N O D Y .

No. III.

MATHLÆ FLACH ILLYRICI—*Varia doctorum priorumque virorum de corrupto Ecclesie statu Poemata*¹

DR. ABRAHAM COLES—*Dies Iræ, in thirteen original versions.*
Fifth edition. New York: 1868.

DR. F. G. LISCO—*Dies Iræ, Hymnus auf das Weltgericht. Berlin.* 1840.

DR. PHILIP SCHAFF—*Translations of Dies Iræ. In "Hours at Home" for May and July, 1868.*

Also, other works cited in previous articles.

BERNARD OF CLUGNY AND THOMAS OF CELANO.

It is a remarkable fact, that the Mediæval centuries—“*The Dark Ages*,” as we are wont to call them—have given us some of the sweetest and purest Christian hymns. Perhaps Dean Goulburn’s theory is the correct one. At the present day Christian principles are more widely diffused; but at the same time they seem more superficial in their influence on the hearts and lives of the professed followers of Christ. In the Middle Ages there was great ignorance and corruption; but walking amid this surrounding darkness we discern the forms of great and eminent saints.

¹A very rare work, in the library of Dr. Philip Schaff. It is probably the only copy in the United States. Published at Basel, 1556.

“There were giants in those days,” but the present age, with all its boasted culture and piety, is not prolific of saints!

At the era of which we write, *two* figures stand boldly out in grand relief—two Christian poets have left succeeding ages a priceless heritage of sacred song, and have then vanished into the surrounding darkness, leaving no other trace of their existence. One sings in rapturous strains of the joys of Heaven—the other tunes his lyre to deeper music; so that we hear, as it were, the awful Trumpet of the Day of Doom.

BERNARDUS CLUNIACENSIS.

was a monk of the Twelfth Century. The date and place of his birth are unknown. Some claim that he was born at *Morlaix* in Bretagne, of English parents; others assign his nativity to *Morlas*, in the lower Pyrenees; while still a third party believe that he was born in England. Of course he is to be distinguished from the more famous Roman Saint, Bernard, Abbot of *Clairvaux*, who was his contemporary. Concerning our author, Bernard de Morlaix, all that we know is that he was a monk of Clugny under Peter the Venerable, (1122-56), and that he has left us this poem. Even the precise date of his death is unknown.

The greatest of his five poems is the one entitled

DE CONTEMPTU MUNDI.

It was written about A. D. 1145, (four centuries before the Reformation), is divided into three books and contains nearly three thousand lines. The greater part of it is a bitter satire on the vices and corruptions of the age, especially such as had invaded the precincts of the Church. But the opening stanzas, by way of contrast, are a glowing description of the purity and joys of Heaven; and this part of the poem alone concerns the translator. Its verse is very difficult and peculiar, being what is called “*Leonine*¹ and tailed rhyme, with lines in three parts, between which

¹*Leonine* *verses*, in which the *casura* *rhymes* with the *end* of the *line*, were so called because invented by *Leon*, a monk of the twelfth century.

a cæsura is not admissible." So difficult is the verse, that the author believed his successful effort the result of the special inspiration of the Holy Spirit. He says in his preface: "I may then assert, not in ostentation, but with humble confidence, that if I had not received directly from on high the gift of inspiration and intelligence, I had not dared to attempt an enterprise so little accorded to the powers of the human mind." From this poem of 3,000 lines, Archbishop Trench, in his "Sacred Latin Poetry," made a cento of ninety-six lines; and on this cento most translators have tried their powers. A few lines of the original may serve as a specimen to those who are not already familiar with it.

Hora novissima, || tempora pessima || sunt, vigilemus.
 Ecce minaciter || imminet arbiter, || ille supremus.
 Imminet, imminet || et mala terminet, || æqua coronet,
 Recta remuneret, || anxia liberet, || æthera donet,
 Auferat aspera || duraque pondera || mentes onusatae,
 Sobria muniat, || improba puniat, || utraque juste.

The most familiar translation, (or rather *paraphrase*), is the beautiful "*Celestial Country*" of Dr. John Mason Neale; from which are taken our well known hymns, "Brief life is here our portion;" "*Jerusalem the golden*," and others in the Hymnal.

But Neale's version is not in the metre of the original, and is on the whole a very free rendering of Bernard's verses.

DR. COLES gives a version of Trench's Cento in a metre somewhat different from the original, beginning :

" *The last of the hours, iniquity towers,*
The times are the worst, let us vigils be keeping!
Lest the Judge Who is near, and soon to appear,
Shall us at His coming find slumbering and sleeping.
He is nigh, He is nigh! He descends from the sky
For the ending of evil, the right's coronation,
The just to reward, relief to afford,
And the heavens bestow for the saints' habitation."

He also gives us (but less happily) a few lines in the original metre :

*“Last hours now tolling are, worst times unrolling are ;
Watch ! there is danger.
Lo ! in sublimity, threatening proximity,
Hover’th th’Avenger !”*

In “The Seven great Hymns,” the opinion is uttered, that the “verse is so difficult that the English language is incapable of expressing it.” (p. 3) This “impossible” task, however, has been attempted several times. M.R. S. W. DUFFIELD gives a version of the Cento, and with what success our readers must judge from this specimen :

*“These are the latter times, these are not better times :
Let us stand waiting.
Lo ! how with awfulness, He, first in lawfulness,
Comes arbitrating.
Land of delightfulness, safe from all spitefulness,
Safe from all trouble,
Thou shalt be filled again, Israel built again ;
Joy shall redouble.”*

Gerard Moultrie, (who ranks next to Edward Caswall as a translator of Latin hymns), meets with better success :

“Fast fall the sands of time, high fills the cup of crime: watch ! For the warning Light through the gloom is shed, showing to quick and dead the Judgment morning ! The world is waxing old, the sum of days is told, the Judge is seated On the white throne of doom : at last the end is come, the work completed. At length the day draws near, the day of woe and fear, the term of ages, That fearful reckoning day, when God to man shall pay his meted wages.”

Having before me the entire poem of Bernard in its Latin original,¹ I had hoped to prepare a translation, in season for this number of the REVIEW, of *all* the verses relating to the Celestial Country ; but other imperative engagements have hindered the work, and I must content myself with a few lines, not following the order of Trench’s Cento.

¹I beg leave in this connection to acknowledge the great kindness of the learned and venerable Dr. Schaff, who has placed at my disposal his valuable library of Hymnological works in the Bible-house, where these lines are written.

BERNHARDVS CLVN.

DE CONTEMPTU MUNDI, AD PETRUM ABBATEM SUUM.

These are the latest hours, Now reign the evil powers,
 Let us be waking.
 Lo! in the eastern sky, Comes the Great Judge on high,
 Just vengeance taking.
 Nearer and nearer draws He, Who will try our cause,
 Rectitude showing;
 Sin's strife to terminate, Sad souls to liberate,
 Heaven's crown bestowing.
 Making rough places straight, Lifting the heavy weight
 Of the mind's burden;
 Chaste souls He fortifies, Guilty hearts terrifies
 With His just guerdon.
 Grand in His power and Love, Comes the King from above
 Just ones to gather:
 Rise, guilty man, appear! See, the GOD-MAN is near,
 Judge from the Father!
 Rise now and swiftly run In the strait way and shun
 Sin, while thou mayest.
 Quickly the King doth come, Speaking thine endless doom,
 If thou delayest.

* * * * *

Rise, man of GOD, arise! Shun error's subtle guise,
 Seek things immortal.
 Let tears of sorrow flow, Still weeping onward go—
 On to Life's portal.
 There light shall meet thy gaze, Light without evening rays,
 Or moonbeams shining:
 New light shall o'er thee stream, Light golden, in its beam
 All rays combining.
 There power and wisdom reign In a land, free from pain,
 Blest in its beauty;
 Kingdoms the Lord bestows On him, who forward goes
 Paths of duty.
 There a new glory shines, Tracing in fairest lines
 Light on the lowly;
 Making dark places plain—While there shall ever reign
 True Sabbaths holy.
 There the glad Hebrew goes Free from his cruel foes,
 Joyfully singing—
 Sings the blest Jubilee, setting sin's captives free—
 Heaven's arches ringing.

That glorious land of light, Safe from the tempest's blight,
 Free from contention,
 Folds in its fond embrace All of true Israel's race,
 Just in intention.
 Land of celestial bowers, Country of fadeless flowers,
 Safe from all danger,
 Thou art for faithful men—There dwells Heaven's citizen,
 Here but earth's stranger.
 Gazing with pious awe On Him, Who gave the Law
 'Mid flames and thunder,
 Knowledge and power are given To the blest sons of Heaven—
 Peace passing wonder.
 Peace for the faithful soul, Reaching salvation's goal
 Through paths of sorrow—
 Peace ne'er to pass away, Knowing no change of day,
 Knowing no morrow.
 Peace, for all sin is past; Peace from the tempest's blast;
 Peace, without striving;
 For weary feet a rest, Anchor for souls distrest,
 Safely arriving.
 Peace shall be given to all. On whom shall peace then fall?
 Souls that live purely,
 Gentle and good in life, Armed for the holy strife,
 Speaking truth surely.
 There bowers with odors teem, There flows Gon's holy stream,
 Faithful souls cheering,
 Souls full of grace and joy—Anthems their tongues employ
 Sweet and endearing.
 There full redemption lives, GOD full refreshment gives,
 Heaven's joy is given:
 Force, sin and grief are fled, Sorrow and strife are dead,
 Pain hence is driven.
 Nought there is weak in years, Nought there is full of tears,
 Nought rent by sorrow.
 There peace forever lives, There joy forever gives
 An endless morrow.
 Here sinful passions rage, Here crimes their warfare wage,
 Peace hath no pity;
 There peace is free from strife, There peace hath endless life
 In Syon's city.
 O sacred stream of joy, O food without alloy!
 Peace, in thy vision
 Sad souls are soothed to rest, Hearts rent by grief are blest
 With joys elysian.

* * * * *

Here brief is mortal life, Here brief our pain and strife,

Here brief our weeping:

Not a brief harvest there Of life and life's short care
 Shall we be reaping.
 O retribution! how Brief is our action now—
 Life is eternal.
 O retribution! then Stand for polluted men
 Mansions supernal.
 What shall be given? to whom? Skies to the sons of doom
 Of a cross worthy:
 Stars to the worms of dust, Blessings to men unjust,
 Heaven to the earthly.
 Now are our battles fought, Then gifts of glory brought:
 What are these prizes?¹
 "Seek you to guess? Hence * *
 * * —from his bright *Presence*."

Full of refreshment's joy—Passion can ne'er annoy,
 Pain ne'er arises.
 Now we but live in hope, Fair Syon scarce can cope
 With Babel's malice.
 Now is her sorrow's hour—Then shall she reign with power
 Crowned in God's palace.
 Soon endless day shall dawn, Night flee before the morn,
 Strife yield to order.
 To him, who purely lives, There joy celestial gives
 God, the Rewarder.
 Then shall the holy hear That blessed sentence clear—
 See, thy King standeth!
 Look on the Prince of day—Ancient laws pass away
 When He commandeth.
 My King my joy shall be, His Sovereign Majesty,
 Brilliantly blazing,
 Shall I behold in love—Nought shall my soul remove,
 Rapturously gazing.
 Jacob as Israel, Leah as fair Rachel
 There shall be greeted.
 Then shall bright Syon's halls, Girt 'round with beauty's walls,
 Stand all-completed.
 O noble Fatherland, For thee we waiting stand,
 Watching, unsleeping.
 Hearing thy sacred name, Love kindles into flame,
 Fond hearts are weeping.
 Mention of thy sweet rest Unction gives to the breast,
 Healing all sorrow,

¹Gerard Moultrie indulges himself here in a most extraordinary rhyme:

Thought of Thy glory bright Sheds heaven's celestial light
 On earth's dark morrow.
 Thou art the one fair spot Sin hath polluted not,
 Dear land of Heaven.
 Tears are not found in thee, Joy dwelleth calm and free,
 Rest shall be given.
 Bright laurel decks thy bowers, Where the grand cedar towers
 Hyssop is growing :
 Carbuncles grace thy halls, Jasper thy radiant walls,
 Evermore glowing.
 Sardius and topaz blaze, Amethyst sheds its rays ;
 But best and rarest
 Of pure gems found in thee, Fair are the saints to see—
 CHRIST is the fairest.
 He is thy Life and Light, He by His Cross in might
 Crushed foes infernal :
 Praises that never cease Ring to the Prince of Peace,
 Praises eternal.
 He is thy golden Dower, Nazareth's Gem and Flower,
 King of the lowly,
 JESUS, both Man and God, Golden Ring, mystic Rod.
 Garden all holy,
 Door and Door-keeper fair, Harbor and Master there,
 Food all-sufficing ;
 He giveth safety free, He bringeth light to thee,—
 Pledge, Bridegroom, Rising.
 Thou art without a shore, Fount flowing evermore,
 Ocean unbounded.
 There stands thy living Rock, There the wild tempest's shock
 Falls back confounded.
 God is that living Stone, God on His sapphire Throne,
 Shield from disaster,
 Rampart inviolate, Ruler of Time and Fate—
 Nought is His master.
 Laurel wreaths crown thy brow, Rich golden dower hast thou,
 Spouse rich in blessing.
 Sweet is thy Prince's kiss, Filling thy soul with bliss,
 God's Love possessing.
 Thy locks white lilies deck, Living pearls on thy neck
 Shine, ever gleaming.
 See, the Lamb by thee stands, Clasps thee with pierc'd hands
 In glory beaming !
 He is thy Peace, Reward, Maker, Redeemer, Guard,
 Life's sacred Portal :
 Thine is to praise His Name, Tell of His Power and Fame
 Through Life immortal.

Thy sweetest, best employ Is to rehearse thy joy,
 Blest anthems singing,
 For sorrow passed away, For joy's eternal day,
 Fond praises bringing.

* * * * *

O golden Syon, blest, Milk-white,¹ in beauty dressed,
 Fair to the vision,
 All hearts must sink oppressed, Could they but see thy rest,
 Thy joys elysian.

I know not, cannot know, How sweet thy song shall grow,
 What light is shining,
 What social joys are there, What special glory fair
 With love combining.

Striving to know that joy, Pure, sweet, without alloy,
 Faint grows my spirit.

O glory fair and blest, Vainly my heart seeks rest
 Thee to inherit.

There are dear Syon's courts, Ringing with hallowed sports,
 Blest martyrs praising ;
 Gleaming with golden throns, Praising their Prince in songs,
 Light o'er them blazing.

There is their pasture land, There drink they waters bland
 From Life's still river.

There God His Throne shall place, There feed His just with grace,
 Praising the Giver.

* * * * *

O lovely Fatherland, Shall I within thee stand,
 Charmed by thy beauty ?

O lovely Fatherland, May He, Who holds my hand,
 Lead me in duty !

THE DIES IRÆ.

A brief sketch of this poem with its wonderful history has been already given in the CHURCH REVIEW.² To it I would add here an

¹Dr. Neale's well-known and pretty version,
 "With milk and honey blest,"

does not convey the true meaning of the original,

Patria lactea. Also, Moultrie, "flowing with milk thy fold."

²See my monograph, "The Dies Iræ," with a cento and paraphrase, in the *American Church Review* for April, 1873.

interesting incident, somewhat similar to my own experience in the Frauenkirche of Dresden, described in that article. Dr. Schaff¹ quotes "the remark of Tholuck, as to the deep sensation produced by the singing of this hymn in the University Church at Halle: 'The impression, especially that which was made by the last words, as sung by the University choir alone, will be forgotten by no one.' An American clergyman, present on the occasion, said: 'It was impossible to refrain from tears, when, at the seventh stanza, all the trumpets ceased, and the choir, accompanied by a softened tone of the organ, sang those touching lines,'

quid sum miser tunc dicturus."

Since the appearance of the REVIEW article alluded to, Gen. Dix has prepared and published (*Scribner's Magazine*, April, 1876) a revision of his translation, which commences:

Day of vengeance, lo ! that morning
On the earth in ashes dawning,
David with the Sibyl warning.

I have prepared a new translation; or, (more properly speaking), will add another to the many preceding failures to render into English verse this untranslatable hymn.

I.

Day of wrath, that day undying !
David and the Sybil, sighing,
Tell of worlds in ashes lying.

What dread fear man's heart benumbeth,
When the Judge in glory cometh,
And all actions strictly summeth !

Then the Trump, with voice astounding
Through earth's sepulchres resounding,
Gathers all, God's Throne surrounding.

Death stands dumb, and nature quivers,
When the creature, earth delivers
To its Judge, 'mid flaming rivers.

He, the written book explaining,
Shows all actions guilt containing,
Thence the world for sin arraigning.

¹ "Hours at Home," May, 1868.

When that awful Judge is seated,
 Hidden things appear completed,
 All have justice duly meted.

What shall I, poor wretch, be saying,
 To what patron saint be praying,
 When the just scarce safe is staying ?

King of majesty and splendor,
 Who to saints free grace dost render,
 Save me, Fount of love most tender !

Think, kind JESU, how my sinning
 Caused Thine earthly path's beginning ;
 Let me not death's doom be winning !

Seeking me Thou sattest tired,
 On the cross for me expired :
 Not in vain be this required !

Righteous Judge of just decision,
 Grant the gift of free remission
 Ere that Day of dread division !

As a culprit stand I grieving,
 Flushed my face, my bosom heaving :
 Spare me, God, my errors leaving !

Thou, Who Mary hast forgiven,¹
 Heardst the thief with anguish riven,
 Me true hope hast also given.

Worthless is my best petition,
 Pity Thou my lost condition,
 Save from endless flame's perdition.

To Thy chosen sheep ally me,
 To the guilty goats deny me,
 On Thy right a place supply me.

When the wicked are accursed,
 In hell's bitter flames immersed,
 Be my name as blest rehearsed !

Hear Thy suppliant to Thee crying,
 See my heart in ashes lying,
 Grant Thy peace to me when dying !

* * * * *

¹The Hymnal of 1874, (which as a work of art is beneath contempt), among its other "improvements" has "tinkered" Dr. Irons' version of the *Dies Irae*. What evil genius could have prompted this disgusting and execrable line,

"Thou the harlot gav'st remission,"
 as a rendering of the beautiful original,
Qui Mariam absolvisti?

On that tearful day of burning,
 Guilty man, from dust returning,
 To Thy judgment comes in terror:
 Spare him GOD, forgive his error!

JESU, Lord of mercy blest,
 Grant them Thine eternal rest!

Amen.

II.

Day of wrath! That awful day
 Shall all worlds in ashes lay,
 David and the Sybil say.
 Oh! what fear shall strike man dumb,
 When th' omniscient Judge shall come,
 All to mark and all to sum!
 Then the trumpet, scattering sound
 Through earth's regions underground,
 Makes the dead GOD's Throne surround.
 Death stands mute 'mid nature's gloom,
 When creation, from its tomb,
 Answers to the Judge's doom.
 See the written Book appear
 With all sins in letters clear;
 Thence the world shall judgment hear.
 When the Judge sits throned in light,
 Hidden things **shine** forth all bright,
 Nought unmarked escapes His sight.
 What shall I, frail man, then say?
 To what guardian creature pray,
 When the faithful fear that Day?
 King of awful majesty,
 Giving grace and mercy free,
 Save me, Fount of piety!
 JESU blest, in pity think,
 Thou for me Death's cup didst drink;
 Let me not to ruin sink!
 Thou for me didst suffer pain,
 On the Cross my life didst gain:
 Let such labor not be vain!
 Righteous Judge of just decree,
 Grant Thy pardon unto me,
 Ere that day of agony! (destiny!)

As a culprit doomed I groan,
 See my blushes, hear my moan:
 Spare, O God—Thy suppliant own !
 Thou, Who Mary didst forgive,
 Bad'st the dying robber live,
 Me Thy hope canst also give.
 Worthless are my prayers and tears—
 Let Thy mercy still my fears,
 Lest I burn through endless years.
 With Thy blest sheep bid me stand,
 Save me from the goats' vile band,
 Place me on Thine own right hand.
 When the accurst to ruin fall,
 Hidden by the fiery pall,
 Me amid thy blest ones call !
 Suppliant at Thy feet I cry,
 See my heart in ashes lie,
 Grant me mercy ere I die !

On that tearful day of doom,
 When man rises from his tomb,
 Guilty man must meet Thee there :
 Spare him, God, in mercy spare !
 Holy JESU, meek and blest,
 Grant, Oh ! grant, eternal rest ! Amen.

DIES ILLA.

AN IMITATION.

Think, dear souls, while yet ye may,
 Of that swift-approaching Day,
 When this world shall pass away :
 When the awful Trump shall sound,
 When the dead beneath the ground
 Rise to meet their Monarch crowned !
 He, Who did for sins atone,
 Seated on His Judgment Throne,
 Shall His faithful people own.
 On His right the blessed sheep,
 Who their sins on earth did weep,
 Shall in joy their harvest reap.

On His left the goats shall stand,
 Banished by His just command
 From the fair Celestial Land.

Open lies the Book of Doom,
 Where the Judgment fires illume
 Sins now risen from their tomb.

Oh ! that Book—what hand shall hide
 Deeds of wrath and thoughts of pride,
 Sins that loud for vengeance cried ?

One blest Hand can blot that page,
 Pierced for guilt of every age
 On the Cross by Satan's rage.

Hark ! the Voice celestial cries :
 " Come, ye blessed ones, arise
 To your mansions in the skies.

Ye did bless Me when in need,
 Did the poor and hungry feed ;
 Ye are Israel's chosen seed ! "

But to sinners shall He cry :
 " Go, ye cursed, from the sky,
 Into flames that never die.

Ye no grace nor love did show
 To the poor on earth below ;
 Hence depart to endless woe ! "

Down they rush to flaming fire,
 Where their worm shall not expire,
 Nor their fierce tormentors tire.

Then to fair Jerusalem's halls,
 Girt by everlasting walls,
 GOD His faithful people calls.

There the light of Peace they see,
 Taste of Life's unfading tree,
 Drink the crystal waters free.

Blessed JESU, meek and mild,
 Born the Virgin's spotless Child,
 Holy, harmless, undefiled :

Think upon Thine earthly years,
 Think upon Thy griefs and fears,
 Save me by Thy bitter tears !

Thou Who didst o'er Syon weep,
 Wake the dead from death's long sleep,
 Still with me Thy covenant keep.

Weeping at Thy feet I lie,
 Still for aid and mercy cry;
 Hear, oh! hear the mourner's sigh!
 On that Day of doom and grace,
 When I meet Thee face to face,
 Grant me with Thy saints a place!

Other versions of the *Dies Iræ* are by *Dr. Abraham Coles*, of Newark, New Jersey :

- (1) Day shall dawn that has no morrow,
 Day of Vengeance, day of sorrow,
 As from Prophecy we borrow.
- (2) Day of vengeance and of Wages,
 Fiery goal of all the ages,
 Burden of prophetic pages!
- (3) Day of Prophecy! it flashes,
 Falling spheres together dashes
 And the world consumes to ashes.
- (4) Day of vengeance, end of scorning,
 World in ashes, world in mourning,
 Whereof Prophets utter warning!
- (5) Day of wrath and consternation,
 Day of fiery consummation,
 Prophesied in Revelation!

Dr. W. R. Williams, New York, 1851 :

Day of wrath! that day dismaying;—
 As the seers of old were saying.
 All the world in ashes laying.

Henry Mills, D. D., of Auburn, New York :

Day of wrath—the sinner dooming,
 Earth with all its work consuming,
 Scripture warns—that day is coming.

Robert Davidson, D. D., Huntingdon, L. I. :

Day of wrath! that day is hastening,
 All the world in ashes wasting,
 David with the Sibyl testing.

Epes Sargent, Esq.:

Day of ire, that day impending,
Earth shall melt, in ashes ending—
Seer and Sibyl so portending.

Anonymous:

Day of wrath ! that day appalling !
Words of ancient Seers recalling :
Earth on fire, in ashes falling.

Erastus C. Benedict, Esq., of New York:

- (1) Day of threatened wrath from heaven,
To the sinful, unforgiven !
Earth on fire, to ashes driven !
- (2) Day of wrath, with vengeance glowing !
Seer and Sibyl long foreknowing !
Earth and time to ruin going !¹

The hymn has been often translated into *German*. Lisco's book, with *eighty-one* versions lies before me. The best is that given by Dr. Schaff in his *Gesangbuch*: (484)

An dem Tag der Zornesfülle
Sinkt die Welt in Aschenhülle :
So zeugt David und Sibylle.

I know of but one translation in *French*, and a very poor one ; not in the metre of the original :

O jour du Dieu vengeur, où pour punir les crimes
Un déluge brûlant sortira des abîmes, etc.

There is a translation in modern *Greek*, (Daniel ii., 105) :

Ὦ ὄργης ἵκειν ἡμέρα,
Καθ' ἣν τέφρα γίνεται σφαῖρα.
Δὲν ἐφέθη φρικτωτέρα.

And another in *Hebrew*, (p 387).

The hymn was shamefully parodied in 1700 by a *Priest* in Holland :

Dies iræ, dies illa
Solvet foedus in favilla,
Teste Tago, Scaldi, Scylla.

¹For these versions I am indebted to Dr. Schaff. See several others, given in full in *Church Review* for April 1873.

The Mantuan slab opens the hymn with four stanzas, which are generally believed to be spurious.

Cogita } anima fidelis,
Queso }
Ad quid respondere velis
Christo venturo de cœlis.

Cum depositet rationem
Ob boni omissionem,
Ob mali commissionem.

Dies illa, dies iræ,
Quam conemur prævenire,
Obviamque Deo iræ, (ire;)
Seria contritione,
Gratiæ apprehensione,
Vite emendatione.

Think, } dear soul, as earth grows hoary,
Ask }
What will be Thine earthly story
When from Heaven Christ comes in glory
When He maketh inquisition
For good earthly deeds' omission,
And thy wilful sins' commission.

O that day, that day of wailing!
Heart and flesh in sorrow failing!
Meet thy God, by grace prevailing;

By a sure and true contrition,
By a meek and mild submission,
By thy life's new, pure condition.

And it concludes with,

Consors ut beatitatis
Vivam cum justificatis
In ævum æternitatis. *Amen.*

Let me live, my Saviour pleasing,
With the just, my joy increasing
In a life of bliss unceasing. *Amen.*

The Hämmerlin text ends with these stanzas:

Laerymosa die illa,
Cum resurget ex favilla,
Tanquam ignis ex scintilla,
Judicandus homo reus;
Huic ergo parce, Deus,
Esto semper adjutor meus!

Quando cœli sunt movendi,
Dies adsunt tunc tremendi,
Nullum tempus penitendi.

Sed salvatis lata dies,
Et damnatis nulla quies,
Sed daemonum effigies.

O tu Deus majestatis
Alme candor Trinitatis,
Nunc conjunge cum beatis!

Vitam meam fac felicem,
Propter tuam genetricem,
Jesse florem et radicem.

On that day of tears and crying,
When from ashes, mutely lying,
Comes, like fire from embers dying,
Man, the guilty, doomed law-breaker,
To Thy Throne, my God and Maker;—
Make me of Thy grace partaker!

With the skies in ruin falling
On that Day of Doom appalling,
Man in vain for help is calling.
To the saved it opens Heaven,
To the doomed no rest is given,
Into shape of demons driven.

God of Majesty most tender,
Trinity's eternal splendor,
With the blest my portion render!

Let my life be free from sighing,
For Thy Parent's sake now crying:
Jesse's flower and root undying.

Praesta nobis tunc levamen,
Dulce nostrum fac certamen,
Ut clamemus omnes, *Amen!*

Aid Thy weak and struggling laymen,
Fight for them with sin's highwaymen,
That our souls may answer, *Amen.*

NOTE.—I beg leave to add here *S. Hilary's* famous morning hymn, which belongs properly to my *first* article, but is of more recent translation.

HYMNUS MATUTINUS.

Lucis largitor splendide,
Cujus sereno lumine
Post lapsa noctis tempora
Dies refusus panditur;

Tu verus mundi Lucifer,
Non is, qui parvi sideris
Ventura lucis nuntius
Angusto fulget lumine,

Sed toto sole clarior,
Lux ipse totus et dies,
Interna nostri pectoris
Illuminans praecordia:

Adesto, rerum conditor,
Paterne lucis gloria,
Cujus admota gratia
Nostra patescant corpora.

Tuoque plena spiritu,
Tecum Deum gestantia,
Ne rapientis perfidi
Diris patescant fraudibus,

Ut inter actus seculi
Vitae quos usus exigit,
Omni carentes crimen
Tuis vivamus legibus.

Probrosas mentis castitas
Carnis vincat libidines,
Sanctumque puri corporis
Delubrum servet Spiritus.

Haec spes precantis animae
Hec sunt votiva munera,
Ut matutina nobis sit
Lux in noctis custodia.n.

Majestic Fount of endless Light,
Whose calm and never-fading Ray
Dispels the noxious shades of night
And pours on earth the joys of day,

Thou, the true Morning Star of earth,
Not that faint-gleaming, orient star,
The messenger of daylight's birth,
That ushers in Aurora's ear,

But, brighter than its brightest gleam,
Thyself all Day, all perfect Light,
Illuminating with Thy Beam
Our hearts' recesses in Thy sight:

Come with the dawn, Creator blest,
Bright Glory of the Father's face,
And pour within each darkened breast
The rich effulgence of Thy grace.

Let not our hearts a temple meet
Where Thou as God shouldst ever dwell,
Be victims of the dire deceit
Of Satan and the hosts of hell,

But 'mid the busy cares of life,
While still we walk as pilgrims here,
Teach us, released from sin and strife,
To do Thy will with holy fear.

May perfect chastity divine
Vanquish each hateful, carnal lust,
And make Thy Spirit's sacred shrine
The hallowed bodies of the just.

This hope inspires each suppliant soul,
This prayer we offer, Saviour blest,
That morn's fair light may onward roll
And guide us safe to night's sweet rest.

JOHN ANKETELL, A. M.

BISHOP JOHNS.

It would be impossible within the limits of an Article in this REVIEW, to do justice to the personal character and work of Bishop Johns. To form any just idea of what he was, we must have before us the events of his life in detail, his familiar letters given, and both arranged, if possible with the skill of Dean Stanley in his life of Arnold.

As the Bishop requested that his manuscripts should not be published, there is no hope of his life being written, and this makes it the more fitting that he should not be allowed to sink into the grave without some imperfect memorial and tribute to his character.

It is a remark as old as Thucydides, that "it is difficult to speak with moderation of the departed, for the hearer, who knows and loves them, will think that you fall short of what he knows, while he, who is unacquainted with them, will think that you exaggerate;" so to those, who never knew Bishop Johns, it is difficult to give any adequate conception of the man.

Bishop Johns, at the time of his death, had nearly completed his eightieth year. He was born in 1796, in the town of Newcastle, Delaware. I am indebted to his classmate in Princeton College, Rev. Dr. Hodge, for some information as to his early life. He was, undoubtedly, by his natural gifts, "fashioned to much honor." It would be very desirable if we knew more of the elements, which, in early life, contributed to the building up of his character. It is just here that most biographies are deficient. The youth of a man, who has lived to old age, is forgotten by his few contemporaries who survive, and many things have even faded from his own memory, and been effaced by nearer and more exciting events.

The character of a man depends so much upon the circumstan-

ces of his birth and education, that John Locke said, that "the difference to be found in the manners and abilities of men, is owing more to their education than to anything else. I think, I may say, that of all the men we meet with, nine out of ten are what they are—good or evil, useful or not—by their education." Bishop Johns was placed in the most favorable circumstances for the best early training. He was brought up in the bosom of a refined and highly cultivated family. His father, Judge Johns, was Chancellor of the State of Delaware. In his native town, there were two churches, the one Episcopal, of which the Rev. Mr. Clay was Rector, and the other Presbyterian. Each of these ministers had an additional country parish, and they so arranged it, that they never officiated in the town the same part of the day on Sunday. Hence it was that the same congregation went in the morning to the one church, and in the afternoon to the other. In Judge Johns' family some of the children were Presbyterians, and others Episcopalian. Under these circumstances, it was not surprising that the Bishop in the early part of his preparatory course, was undecided as to the church in which he should minister. The late Rev. Dr. James P. Wilson, afterwards an eminent Presbyterian minister, was a distinguished lawyer, and an intimate friend of Judge Johns. It is not a little singular, that under his advice the Bishop decided to enter the ministry of the Episcopal Church, Dr. Hodge says:

This decision, although neither of us at the time knew anything about it, determined my whole course in life. When Dr. Archibald Alexander was appointed Professor in the Seminary at Princeton, he had under his care the departments of didactic, polemic, and pastoral theology, together with instruction in Hebrew. He soon found that this was too burdensome, and therefore determined to select some young man, on whom he might devolve the Hebrew department. He selected Johns. When he decided to enter the Episcopal Church, he took up with me. Johns was always first, first everywhere, and first in everything. His success was largely due to his conscientious determination always to do his best. He was always thoroughly prepared for every exercise in the College and in the Seminary. When in the Seminary, he would be able, day after day to give what Turretin, our text book, calls the state of the question—stating that the question is not this or that, until every foreign element is eliminated, and then the precise point in hand is laid down with unmistakable precision. Then follow in distinct paragraphs, the arguments in its support; then come the answers to objections. Dr. Alexander was accustomed to give us from twenty to forty quarto pages in Latin to read for a recitation. When we came to recite, the professor would place the book before him and ask, What is the state of the question? What is the first argument, etc? Then, what is the first objection

and its answer? Dr. Johns would be able, day after day, to give the state of the Question, all the arguments in its support in their order, all the objections and the answers to them, through the whole thirty or forty pages, without the professor saying a word to him.

As I have quoted Dr. Hodge's letter, I cannot forbear giving further his beautiful tribute to the memory of his classmate for seven years, first in the College, and then in the Seminary.

In the great day of penitential sorrow, predicted by the prophet, it is said, "Every family shall mourn apart." So when such a man as Bishop Johns is taken away, the whole land mourneth, his own household, his church, the community, each apart, so I mourn alone. He was an honor and blessing to his Church, but he was to me, what he was to no one else. With the single exception of my own and early brother, I never had such a friend. For nearly sixty-four years we were as intimate and confidential as though we had been born at one birth. In all this time, to the best of my recollection, there was never an angry word passed between us. I feel like the last tree of a forest. Two of our college vacations of six weeks each, I spent with him in his home at Newcastle. We prayed together, and in social religious meetings told the people the little we knew of Christ, helping each other out. He was only eighteen months my senior, yet his feeling towards me was always somewhat paternal. He used to say, "that he brought me up, and if I did not take care he would bring me down." If he approved of anything I had written, his usual way of expressing it was, "Charles, I think I wrote that." Alas! alas! he is gone, I cannot speak of him, except as to what he was to me, so good, so kind, so loving, without a shadow of change for sixty-four years. Our last interview in May last, was the most loving of our whole lives. The recollections and love of sixty years were gathered into those few hours. Our parting was solemn, tender and lingering. We looked steadily at each other with tearful eyes, knowing that possibly and even probably it was for the last time, but in the calm hope that in any event the separation could not be for long. I have no such friend on earth. I mourn apart.

After his ordination by Bishop White,¹ in 1819, he began his ministry in Frederick, Maryland. From the start, he took a high rank as a preacher. Dr. Hodge says, that he told him, that he always began to write his sermon on Monday morning, got it done by Wednesday evening, and began to commit it on Thursday morning.

Bishop Johns as a *preacher*, had a rare combination of natural

¹ Bishop Johns entered Princeton College in 1812; the Theological Seminary in 1816; was ordained by Bishop White in 1819; began his ministry in Frederick, Md., became Rector of old Christ Church, Baltimore, 1829; was consecrated Assistant Bishop of Virginia, 1842; became Bishop by the death of Bishop Meade, in 1862.

gifts. He had a well modulated voice, an earnest and impassioned delivery, with much and graceful gesture, a memory so tenacious, that all he knew was at his command and never seemed to fail him, and the rare gift of unction. He never, to my knowledge, used a manuscript, nor any notes whatever, not even when preaching on that grand and solemn occasion, before the General Convention in 1871, in Baltimore. He told me, that he would be as much embarrassed by the use of a manuscript, as a person who was in the habit of using one would be without it. Of his Sermon before the General Convention, Bishop Selwyn said "we heard words which should bind us all together in one heart, and in one soul, from the one simple principle so clearly pointed out to us by that reverend pastor, who addressed us yesterday *that the love of Christ constraineth us.*" Dean Howson further said :

I could not help thinking of the Apostle Paul during the concluding words of that most effective, most serious sermon, which we had the advantage of listening to from the Bishop, who was the preacher yesterday. I felt that he had concentrated in that sermon, the main spirit of St. Paul's life and character, and it seemed to me as he spoke (evidently showing the traces of long experience and hard work), that there was a persuasiveness in his language and his manner of speaking, which was extremely like what must have been witnessed and heard by those who listened to the great Apostle, and I felt deeply thankful that you care for the spiritual religion of each individual soul in communion with our living and personal Saviour. The impression at the close of that sermon was simply this, that I never before had fully understood the depth and breadth of those words which we are constantly using in our public worship, "I believe in the Holy Catholic Church, the communion of Saints."

Bishop Johns began, as we have seen, by memorizing his sermons, which he had previously written. This habit, after a time, he discontinued, and in its place he wrote his sermon on his mind, and to assist him in pursuing the same train of thought and language, he wrote down on a scrap of paper the first word of every sentence. This he carried with him into the pulpit, though he made no use of it. While such a method of preparation could not be judiciously recommended to every one, no doubt it was the best for him. He laid the foundation by a thorough study of his matter. He had that most valuable of all acquisitions, the methodical arrangement of his thoughts and words, grounded on the habit of foreseeing in every sentence the whole that he intended to communicate. In this way, he avoided the usual faults of what is

called extemporaneous speech, its shallowness, discursiveness, and wearisome repetition.

This habit no doubt contributed to his remarkable readiness of speech on all occasions, in which I never knew anyone in Congress, or at the bar to excel him. He never seemed to find any difficulty in expressing himself, and that by the most apt and felicitous words. No difference in his style could be detected when called upon unexpectedly to speak, or when he had time to study his subject previously. All these natural and acquired gifts gave him great reputation as a preacher. Whenever he preached, the people pressed to hear him. He had also the power, greatly to be coveted, of adapting himself to every audience. On one occasion he told me, that he had not decided what sermon to preach, till he had seen the audience. It need scarcely be said to all who have heard him, that like his great prototype, the Apostle Paul, he testified "repentance towards God, and faith towards our Lord Jesus Christ." He was of the mind of his favorite, Archbishop Leighton, that "to exhort men to holiness and the duties of a christian life without instructing them in the doctrine of faith, and bringing them to Jesus Christ, is to build a house without a foundation. And, on the other side, to instruct the mind in the knowledge of divine things, and neglect the pressing of that practice and power of godliness, is to forget the building, that ought to be raised upon that foundation once laid, which is likewise a point of very great folly."

Bishop Johns gloried in the Cross of Christ. He led his hearers there, and besought them to turn aside, and see the great sight of a crucified Saviour. He might have applied to himself the words, "when we rise, the cross; when we lie down, the cross; when we go out, and when we come in, the cross; at all times and in all places, the cross, shining more glorious than the sun." Whatever was his subject, he seemed to be led naturally by it to speak of Christ. His sermons were variations of one theme, which to him never lost its freshness and interest and power, but seemed to grow upon him, as though he was telling the good news of salvation as *news*, and not as a thrice told tale, as though he had received it fresh from heaven, as though he had himself believed it for the first time. On the fifty-fifth anniversary of his ordination, he

preached in the chapel of the Theological Seminary, and after expressing his gratitude to God that He had called him by His grace to the ministry of reconciliation, and granted him so long a continuance in it; he earnestly and affectionately exhorted his young brethren never to be weary in the service of their Lord and Master. He was a laborious preacher, and labored to the last. It was no uncommon thing for him to preach twice a day, and that for a fortnight together. His favorite subjects were, The martyrdom of Stephen—In My Father's house are many mansions—Compel them to come in—Who of God is made unto us wisdom, etc.,—Many shall seek to enter in and shall not be able—My heart is fixed—Serving the Lord.

It may be expected, that something should be said of Bishop Johns position as to the questions which agitate our church. To urge his own words, in speaking of the Seminary at Alexandria, "the ecclesiastical polity inculcated and maintained here has been that set forth in the preface to the ordination service—so much, no more, no less." He held with Bishop White, that "while the Church of England decidedly set her foot on the ground of the Apostolic origin of episcopacy, she carefully avoided passing a judgment on the validity of the ministry of other churches." In his letter to the Rev. Mr. Latanè, he quoted with approbation Archbishop Usher's declaration, "However I must needs think, that the churches which have no Bishops are thereby become very much defective in their government, but I do love and honor these churches as true members of the Church Universal."

In the same letter, he interprets the canon, "of persons not ministers of this Church, officiating in any congregation thereof," "as not declaring that no persons are *Ministers* except those ordained to minister in this church, but simply that such only are allowed to officiate for our people." Adopting these views, he felt it his duty to act with those out of our church in the Bible Society, and thus promote a good understanding among christians of different denominations, and cultivate peace and good will among all christian people. He was unwilling, so far as he had influence, that our church should assume an isolated attitude towards the great mass of fellow christians. He was of opinion that there was a common ground of co-operation, and a centre of union in such a

cause as that of the American Bible Society, and he advocated its cause, a few years ago, in a powerful speech at its Anniversary. He did not believe that in doing so he sacrificed the attachment he owed his own church, nor surrendered the *smallest atom* of his own opinions and practices. He loved in truth the good of every name, and his prayer was that of the Apostle, grace be with all them, who love the Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity!

As *Bishop*, in the administration of the affairs of his own Diocese, and of the general church, he manifested wisdom, faithfulness, promptness in the exercise of discipline and love. In his first Address to the Council of his Diocese, he said, "my heart's desire and prayer to God is, that I may be blessed with the faithful and affectionate spirit, with which Bishop Moore served Christ, and be honored to sustain the church in this Diocese." He did not boast of the authority which the Lord had given him for the edification of his church, nor assert any claims of prerogative, which would be called in question, and lead to controversy, but exercised his office with such gentleness and prudence, that due obedience was rendered willingly by all.

In his letter to the Rev. Mr. Latanè who withdrew from the church, after showing that his reasons for so doing were invalid, he closes in this affectionate manner.

"Paul and Barnabas departed asunder—that was all—neither of them *withdrew from the church*. If, however, you think you must make the experiment, I trust you will only depart for a season, and if my already prolonged life is extended so far, you will find me ready, or rather hastening, as fast as my tottering steps will permit, to welcome you to your early home."

In his opposition to Ritualism he was firm and decided. He was one of the twenty-eight Bishops who signed a declaration against it,¹ and in one of his Annual Addresses he expressed his disapprobation of floral decorations in churches.

¹The Declaration of twenty-eight Bishops, drafted by Bishop Coxe, January 10th, 1867, contains the following: "We therefore consider, that in this particular National Church, any attempt to introduce into the public worship of Almighty God usages that have never been known, such as the use of incense, and the burning of lights in the order for the Holy Communion, *reverences to the Holy Table, or to the elements thereon*, the adoption of clerical habits hitherto unknown, or material alterations of those in use, is an innovation which violates the discipline of the church."

In the General Convention of 1871, he had an important influence in the all but unanimous adoption by the Bishops of the Declaration, touching the meaning of the service for Infant Baptism, that "we declare, that in our opinion, the word 'Regenerate' is not there so used as to determine that a moral change in the subject of Baptism is wrought by that sacrament." He told me, that the word "*determine*," occurred to him as the best word, while passing a sleepless night before its passage. On the question of some alternate form in the Baptismal service, he thus expressed himself in his last Address to his Diocese, May 1875.

The concession as to the use of the Baptismal office, though not accorded to the memorialists,¹ by the General Convention, received a consideration, which does not discourage the hope, that the day is coming when this occasion of complaint will be satisfactorily removed. Meanwhile, as the faulted phrase is no innovation, but the language of the formularies of this church from its organization, and of the Reformers in England and on the continent, and as it has been judicially decided, that its import harmonizes, as I verily believe it does, with the views of Baptism, maintained by the school of theology to which the memorialists belong, I can see no reason why they may not with good conscience minister as their fathers have done.

It is well known, that Bishop Johns was a Professor in the Theological Seminary of Virginia. He gave instruction to successive senior classes in Pastoral Theology and Homiletics. His facility of communication, his vivacity of manner, and his ready utterance gave the greatest value to his instructions. Many of his pupils will never cease to remember with reverence and love his kindly and discriminating criticism of their first attempts at sermonizing. His sympathetic and loving heart made him the friend and father of the young men, with whom he was brought in contact.

We hasten on to speak of Bishop Johns as a *man*. Here so much depends upon the presence, the voice, the eye, the whole "manner of the man," that it is difficult to represent his character to those who did not know him. His personal character endeared him to his friends, and shed a grace and dignity over every circle in which he moved, and drew all hearts to him. His colloquial animation,

¹The memorialists in 1874, had "expressed the hope and earnest desire that liberty be allowed, *without change in the text of the office, to omit the phrases in the post baptismal service in which the word "regenerate" occurs.*

his warm and cordial greeting, the indescribable charm of his manner, his playful humor, the bright twinkle of his eye, the culture and deportment of a perfect gentleman, made him a delightful companion. What Tacitus said of his father-in-law was true of him. *Nihil metus in vultu; gratia oris supererat, bonum virum facile crederes, magnum libenter.* We have seen from Dr. Hodge's letter what a friend he was. So tender and lasting was his love to his parents, that he told a friend that from the day of his parents' death there never was *one* day he had not thought of them, and recollected how they looked when he last saw them.

But the time drew nigh when Bishop Johns must die. He had filled his days, and attained the age of which the Psalmist says that it is but labor and sorrow. Time had dealt gently with him, and impaired but little, apparently, of the vigor of his frame, nor could it be perceived, that the activity of his mind was diminished. He was interested in the new books of the day, nor did he give up his love for the old Theology of the Church of England. On Ash-Wednesday, he took out of the library two volumes of Bishop Bull's works, and was deeply interested in Henry Roger's Supernatural Origin of the Bible, Goodell's Life, and Ker's Sermons. He preached for the last time, February 19th, 1876, and soon after had a slight attack of paralysis, and felt and said, that his work was done.

He bore with gentle patience the wearisome nights appointed him till "the voice at midnight came." Some of his last words were gathered up by those who were with him, and we give them for the comfort and encouragement of those who have yet to meet the last enemy, and to walk through the valley, which separates the land of the living from the untried hereafter. Among much that he said in solemn, earnest tones were these words. "I would not raise a finger to dictate; it is all well. If the Lord had ordered it, I would willingly have labored on in this service. I *loved my work*, but God has ordered it otherwise. If the Lord raises me up, I would strive to preach Christ with more zeal, and His love, more impressively. I have preached it all my life, and if I were to get up to-morrow, I could preach nothing better than that." Often would he repeat the couplet,

"I'm a poor sinner and nothing at all,
And Jesus Christ is my all in all."

saying afterwards, "That's enough, that is the Gospel," again, "The sting of death is taken away, Victory! Victory!" When told how his people were praying for him in all the churches, he said, "May the Great High Priest take them all, and present them before God. What a comfort to have the prayers of God's people! May God answer them all, unworthy as I am." The Sunday morning before he died, as he was raised up in bed, he exclaimed, "Oh, beautiful dawn of day! What will it be when the day dawns that has no end! Glory be to God on high, on earth peace, good will towards men! A glorious day. He rose this day! O God, send down Thy Holy Spirit upon Thy church and Thy ministers. May they proclaim Thy Gospel with power this day to the salvation of souls! God bless my church, my ministers, my people," (opening his arms as if he would embrace them all) "and fold them in the arms of the everlasting covenant." He was often heard praying aloud for "humility" for "grace to bear and be benefited by this trial," "to be kept from the tempter's power." When too weak to speak aloud, his whispers were heard, "Guide me—wash me—clothe me—help me—under the shadow of Thy wings." In his last conscious moments, with all his dear family kneeling around him, his youngest son a clergyman, read the prayer, commanding the soul of this servant of Christ "into the hands of a faithful Creator, and most merciful Saviour."

JOSEPH PACKARD.

THE SECOND REUNION CONFERENCE AT
BONN, AUGUST, 1875.

A PERSONAL NARRATIVE.

Early in the morning of the first Saturday in August, 1875, we met by appointment at the Victoria Station, in London, the Secretary of the Venerable Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts, the Rev. Prebendary Bullock, and the Secretary of the Anglo-Continental Society, the Rev. Prebendary Meyrick, who were to be fellow travellers on the journey to Bonn. We passed in swift succession the Cathedrals of Rochester and Canterbury, and were soon looking regretfully at the receding cliffs of Dover, as we experienced the roughness of the Channel passage. Once across, the journey to Brussels was neither tedious nor disagreeable, and the rest of Sunday in this lovely city proved an agreeable preparation for the exciting and exhausting duties of the week. We lingered on our way to visit the shrines and shops of Cologne, and here were joined by the Lord Bishop of Gibraltar, Dr. Sanford, with whom we proceeded by steamer up the Rhine to Bonn.

Already the Conference had begun, although our little party, reinforced at the last moment by the arrival of the Dean of Chester, Dr. Howson, was the van-guard of the English and American delegation. A number of the Orientals had arrived early in the week, with a view to conference among themselves, and with the Old Catholic theologians. On the morning of the 10th of August, there was a preliminary meeting of Easterns and Old Catholics, at the Episcopal residence of Bishop Reinkens, and it was agreed, after an informal interchange of views, that Pro-

fessor Ossinin, of St. Petersburgh, than whom, as it proved, no keener dialectitian was in attendance, should formulate the opinions of the Easterns on the dogmatic questions to be considered, and present the result at a similar conference on the following day. The Oriental element present was not only large, embracing as it did upwards of a score of names; but it was composed of prelates, dignitaries and counsellors of State, representing various geographical divisions of the Greek Church. Among these delegates, constituting by far the greatest and most distinguished representation of Eastern theologians the West has seen since the Council of Florence, four centuries ago; we may name first and foremost the late Venerable Lycurgus, Archbishop of Syra and Tenos—alas! that he has passed to rest!—clad in the rich Oriental costume betokening his rank, with an *icon* set in precious stones on his breast, and bearing traces in his enfeebled walk and almost inaudible voice, of his nearing the last of life. The presence of this Prelate, whose visit to England and conferences with dignitaries of the Anglican Church, will be remembered by all who have taken an interest in the questions connected with Eastern intercommunion, gave especial dignity to the conference, in the progress and results of which he continued to show interest till the close of his honored and useful life. On either side of the Archbishop sat two Roumanian prelates, Gennadius, Bishop of Argesu, and Melchisedek, Bishop of Dunarei-de-jom; forming in their Episcopal habits and with their Oriental features, a singularly picturesque grouping, quite striking to Western eyes. With them were three Archimandrites, Sabbas, from Belgrade, Anastasiades and Bryennios, from Constantinople, deputed to represent the Patriarch; the Archpriest Janyshew; a Doctor in Theology from Macedonia; Professors from Dalmatia, Athens, the Shores of the Euxine, Kiew, and St. Petersburgh, together with several laymen of rank and theological attainments. Thus notable was the Eastern representation at this Second Reunion Conference.

Later on the day of our arrival we found our numbers increased by the presence of Canon Liddon, confessedly the leading theologian, as he is certainly the most brilliant preacher, of the English Church. With him came the well-known Malcolm MacColl, a

trenchant writer, as we already knew, and a forcible speaker as well, as we shortly found out. The Master of University College, Durham; the Rev. F. S. May, the well-known editor of the Colonial Church Chronicle; the Rev. Lewis M. Hogg, for years a leading member of the Anglo-Continental Society, with a score or more of other clergymen of the English Church, two or three from Scotland, and the Rev. Lord Plunkett, and the Rt. Hon. Master Brooke, from the Church of Ireland, made up the representation from the United Kingdom, to which were now added, of the American Church, Rev. Dr. Henry C. Potter, of New York, Secretary of the House of Bishops, the Rev. Dr. Robert J. Nevin, rector of St. Paul's, Rome, the Rev. Dr. Wm. Chauncey Langdon, so long connected with the Italian Reform movement, the Rev. John B. Morgan, rector of the Church of the Holy Trinity, Paris, France, together with the Rev. Dr. Wm. P. Lewis, of Central Pennsylvania, the Rev. H. F. Hartmann, of New Jersey, the Rev. G. W. Hodge, of Philadelphia, and the Rev. T. A. Snively, of Albany.

In the evening of Wednesday, the 11th of August, the venerable Dr. Von Döllinger received the English and Americans at the Episcopal residence of Bishop Reinkens. Too numerous for the accommodations offered by the modest "palace," of this truly primitive Bishop, the guests were received in the gardens of the Bishop, which were brilliantly illuminated, and where we had the pleasure of meeting, face to face, not only the notabilities present from abroad, but the leaders of the Old Catholic movement. Where all were men of mark, the grand central figure of the venerable Von Döllinger was pre-eminent. Speaking English with the ease and perfectness of a native, he was especially the object of the interest and regard of the Americans present. To them in coming so far to show their sympathy in this reunion movement, the great theologian showed marked attention. His great familiarity with our ecclesiastical annals, citing volumes, of the existence of which he could scarcely be supposed to be aware, his firm grasp of the peculiarities of our organization, and his acquaintance with our present and prospective successes, proved the wide range of his observation and the universality of his knowledge.

Patient, considerate, with a friendly greeting for all, and a courtesy equal to the task of entertaining the crowd that ever surrounded him, we felt that in hearing him speak and in watching the changing expression of his scholarly, striking features, we were hearing and seeing the greatest man of his age.

Second only to the Nestor of the Old Catholic movement was the genial and attractive Bishop Joseph Hubert Reinkens, the fascination of whose presence was felt by all. Gentleness and goodness, purity and piety, added to courtly manners and a rare personal address, gave him the power of winning all hearts; and the interest of the Americans in the good Bishop, was not diminished when he vied with Von Döllinger in reiterating loving reminiscences, and in making earnest inquiries, respecting the Bishop of Pittsburgh, whose presence at the first reunion Conference, in 1874, had been so marked a feature in that most important meeting, and whose interest and sympathy in the Old Catholic movement had been marked from the first. Less widely known, but each a man of note, were Drs. Langen, Menzel, Reusch, the able secretary of the Conference, and Knoodt, Professors at Bonn, and Professor Herzog, of Switzerland, the Bishop-designate of the Swiss Old Catholics. These, with earnest and devout-looking *Pfarrers* from various parts of the Empire, and some laymen of high position and rank, made up the Old Catholic representation. Von Schulte, Huber, and Freiderich were unfortunately absent, but enough were present to impress each of us with the intellectual strength of the Old Catholic movement and the purity and piety of its leading men.

No more memorable evening has place in my remembrance; and in the profound feeling pervading the whole gathering and the deep earnestness of everyone present, whether from near or from far, there was good hope for the future of a religious movement springing, as Bishop Reinkens so well expressed it, "*from the Spirit of God by means of conscience.*"

The second preliminary meeting of the Orientals and Old Catholics was closed by the presentation of the following paper, prepared by Dr. Von Döllinger :

"Confession of Faith in reference to the Holy Ghost in the language of the fathers: "

1. The Son is with the Father the Fountain of the Holy Ghost (Athanasius).
2. All which the Spirit has He has from the Logos (Athanasius).

3. The Spirit does not unite the Logos with the Father, but receives from Him (to be understood of the immanent divine economy, according to Epiphanius).

4. The Spirit is partaker of the Son, *μέτοχον τοῦ νιοῦ* (deducted from "He shall take of Mine," and evidently understood of the community in being). (Cyril of Alexandria).

5. The Spirit is related to the Son as the Son is related to the Father (Basilus; his expression is: *συνέτακται*).

6. The Son is Prototype (*πρωτότυπος*) of the Spirit (the so-named Confession of Faith of St. Gregory Thaumaturgus; the same expression used of the Father with reference to the Son).

7. The expressions which the fathers use of the relation of the Son to the Holy Ghost point decidedly to a substantial emanation; the Spirit is poured out (*προχέιται*) or wells forth (*προύεναι, αναβλύζειν*) from the Son. His going forth from the Son is according to Chrysostom, like that of water from the fountain.

8. It is only the same thought, otherwise turned, when Athanasius says: The Spirit has all that He has from the Son (therefore before all, Being itself).

9. That the Spirit actually has Being from the Son, even as the Son has His from the Father, stands in so many words in Gregory of Nyssa (at the conclusion of the first book against Eunomius).

10. We acknowledge with Gregory of Nyssa, that in the Trinity there is no other difference than this, that the one Person is the Principle, the others from the Principle. The Son is accordingly not Principle, but only from the Principle—namely, from the Father as the common Principle (*ἀρχὴ*).

11. We appropriate to ourselves the doctrine of Cyril of Alexandria:

a. The Spirit is by nature (*φύσις*) in the Son, as the Son is in the Father (springs therefore also from His Being);

b. The Spirit inheres substantially in the Son;

c. By means of both (the Father and the Son) the Spirit goes forth;

d. The Spirit is the own Spirit of the Being of the Son."¹

Such was the state of the discussion when the more general sessions of the Conference were opened on the morning of the 12th of August.

We assembled to the number of upwards of one hundred, full

¹ In our quotations from papers and speeches made at the Conference we have in general availed ourselves of the translation of the "Bericht über die vom 10, bis 16, August, 1875, zu Bonn gehaltenen Unions-Conferenzen, in Auftrage des Vorsitzenden Dr. von Döllinger herausgegeben von Dr. Fr. Heinrich Reusch, Professor der Theologie—Bonn, P. Neusser, 1875." This translation made by the Rev. Prof. Buel, D.D., of the Gen. Theological Seminary, New York, and prefaced by the Rev. Dr. Nevin, of Rome, is published by Mr. Thomas Whittaker, Bible House, New York City, and well deserves the reading of every intelligent Churchman.

half of whom were English or Americans, in the Music Hall of the University of Bonn. There was no question as to the presidency of the meeting. Every eye was turned to the venerable theologian at whose summons we had met together, and for whose lightest word each one waited in profound expectation. With characteristic modesty he had proffered the chair to the learned Dr. Wordsworth, Lord Bishop of Lincoln, but this eminent prelate, though in full sympathy with the object of the meeting, was unable to be present, and the invitation served only to show the good feeling existing between the Old Catholics and the Anglican Church. The simple organization being effected, Dr. Von. Döllinger opened the proceedings with an address, or rather an historical lecture, in which with masterly skill and perspicuity he traced the connection between the controversy, which, for centuries, had separated the Eastern Church from the West, with the revolutionary movement of to-day emanating from the Vatican. It would be impossible to present in other or in fewer words than in those of the great ecclesiastical historian himself, an address which gave the keynote to the Conference, and held the audience, even those but little versed in the language in which it was delivered, enthralled from its opening sentence to the close.¹

Following this noble utterance, which we hope our readers will peruse in order that they may grasp somewhat the nature of the subjects treated and the mode of treatment pursued in this gathering of long parted Christian men, Professor Ossinin, after a graceful acknowledgment of the eloquence and thought of the opening address, offered a paper as embodying the views of the Orientals on the main question under consideration. This "Scheme" was as follows:²

"We believe and teach, that in the Holy Trinity there is only one Principle (*ἀρχή*), and that this Principle, of the Son as well as of the Spirit, is the Father—the word *ἀρχή* taken according to the interpretation of John of Damaseus, that *ἀρχή* is that only, which is *ἀναρχον*.

¹ We have not space for quotation—the address in full will be found on page 26 of the "Bonn Conference of 1875."

² Bonn Conference, p. 35.

We profess that the Eastern Church is wholly right in holding fast to the expression, "The Spirit goes forth from the Father," while it understands by the Procession (*ἐκπορεύεσθαι*) that primordial divine activity by virtue of which the Son is endowed with the capability of sending forth, and the Spirit is also immediately from the Father.

We grant that the relation of the Son to the Spirit is not wholly the same as that of the Father to the Spirit, because Paternity, in the wider sense, or the property of being the Fountain of the Divine persons, does not appertain to the Son, but only to the Father. In so far, therefore, the Eastern Church is justified in rejecting the *procedere ab utroque* or a *Patre Filioque*, as it connects with the *ἐκπορεύεσθαι* a sense different from the *procedere* of the Latins—namely, that of the causality which appertains only to the Father (*μονος γὰρ αἴτιος ὁ Πατὴρ*), against which the Latins disregard the difference between the action of the Father and that of the Son, with reference to the Spirit, and only have in view the common concurrence, the co-operation of the Father and of the Son, in their *procedere ab utroque*.

In regard to the temporal sending forth of the Spirit through Son and Father, there is no difference of doctrine between East and West.

A discussion of the various points of this "scheme" followed, in which the patience, forbearance, wisdom, ready acquaintance with every phase of this controversy of a thousand years duration, and the absolute mastery of the whole range of patristic theology and thought, displayed by the untiring President were most fully displayed. The morning session, the debates of which had been in German, which had been ascertained to be the only common language of the Orientals and Occidentals, closed with the feeling on every side that God's Spirit was with His servants, in their efforts to lead the way to a fuller realization of the Lord's high-priestly prayer in behalf of His people—"That they all may be one!"

The afternoon discussions were conducted in the English language, and were prefaced by the reading of two important communications, one from the Lord Bishop of Winchester, Harold Browne, and the other from no less a personage than the late Premier of England, Mr. Gladstone. The impression made by the reading of these letters was so marked, and the interest excited so great, especially the latter, which, on account of the peculiar chirography of the writer, was first essayed by Canon Liddon, and finally and successfully by Mr. MacColl, that we call especial attention to them, and express a hope that our readers will peruse them.¹ Both will be found of value, especially in view

¹ They will be found on pp. 43-52 of the translation referred to.

of the persistent misrepresentations of the aims and results of the Conference, which for a time filled the press in England, from the "Times" and the "Westminster Review," down to the most obscure journals of the day, and were to a certain extent reproduced on this side of the water. The interest shown by the Lord Bishop of Winchester (then of Ely), in the visit of the Archbishop of Syra and Tenos to England, and the share his Lordship, in common with the Bishops of Lincoln and Maryland, had earlier taken in the Old Catholic movement, made his words of the greatest moment.

Leaving these weighty communications to the grave consideration of the various representatives present, the President alluded to the question of the validity of Anglican Orders, left unsettled the year before. He proposed, in view of the presence of Oriental theologians in greater numbers than at any Western assembly for centuries, to set forth in detail for their information, as they had scarcely had occasion to occupy themselves with the subject, the grounds which had led the Old Catholics to the full acceptance of the Anglican succession. The Bishop of Gibraltar for the English, and the Rev. Dr. Chauncey Langdon in the name of the Americans, and reiterating the manly language of the Bishop of Pittsburg in 1874, deprecated any *discussion* of the validity of Anglican Orders, but united with Canon Liddon and Dean Howson, in the wish that Dr. Von Döllinger would give in detail the historical facts of the question, for the information of the Orientals, who had been for several centuries dependant upon the Romish theologians for their knowledge respecting the consecration of Archbishop Parker. Reserving this explanation for a later period in the Conference, the discussion, which had now become of absorbing interest, was continued by Prebendary Meyrick, whose dignified bearing, persuasive manner and complete knowledge of the subject, secured marked attention for whatever he proposed, and by Canon Liddon, who ably sustained his reputation for theological learning and pre-eminent eloquence. The session closed with the presentation of two propositions; one that of Canon Liddon, set forth in a speech of great power; and a second, offered by the Dean of Chester, the Rev. Dr. Howson.

Canon Liddon's proposition was as follows: (p. 58.)

"The Holy Ghost proceeds eternally from the Father alone, in the sense that the Father alone is the Fountain of Deity, but He also proceeds eternally, as we believe, through the Son.

While for ourselves—subject to the future decision of a truly Ecumenical Council—we retain the formula, that the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Father and the Son, we do not believe that there are two principles or two causes in the Godhead; but we believe in one principle and one cause.

So we begin with a concession, since we accept the *ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς μόνον* of the *Confessio orthodoxa*. This expression belongs not to the patristic, but to the period of the Oriental theology, which one can name the scholastic. But it can be taken in the sense, in which, in fact, it is not impugned, in the sense that in the mystery of the divine life, the Father alone is the Fountain of Deity. It is entirely accordant with this, when we add, that the Holy Ghost goes forth eternally THROUGH the Son, and when we even abide by our Western formula, according to which He goes forth FROM the Father and the Son. For He goes forth from the Son, not as from a second cause, or a second principle, but as from the Co-essential with the Father, through whom He ceaselessly goes forth from the Father. The proposed formula concludes with a rejection of the thought of two principles or causes in the Deity. The West has at an earlier period repeatedly rejected this error, but the rejection can not too often be repeated, since many Orientals, as it seems, cannot free themselves from the idea that this error stands in a necessary connection with our doctrine of the Pro-cession of the Holy Ghost from the Father and the Son."

Dr. Howson's formula was briefer : (p. 61.)

While the Orientals retain their customary formula *ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς*, and while the Westerns retain their longer formula *ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς καὶ τοῦ Υἱοῦ*, both agree that the formula *ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς διὰ τοῦ Υἱοῦ* expresses accurately the theological truth held by both.

While the days at Bonn were thus given to the German and the English discussions, the members of the English, Scottish, Irish and American Churches assembled every morning and evening, and often at noontime as well, in the apartments of the Lord Bishop of Gibraltar at the "Golden Star" Hotel, which was the head-quarters of our party, primarily for prayer, and after our acts of united worship, for mutual interchange of opinion respecting the public discussions. No more courteous or agreeable prelate could have been selected to represent the English hierarchy than the learned and amiable Dr. Sanford; while his personal relations with the Primate made his presence and opinions of great weight. It was at one of these gatherings in the Bishop's rooms, and at that stage in the proceedings we have reached in our narrative, that it devolved upon the Anglicans and Americans to

choose members of a committee of the larger body to meet for freer discussion, and, if possible, to settle upon some basis of agreement to be presented to the General Conference. Of this committee Canon Liddon and Prebendary Meyrick were almost without discussion chosen by the English. The Rev. Dr. Nevin, our accomplished Chaplain at Rome, was selected to represent the American Church, both from his long and intimate relations with the Old Catholic leaders, as well as in view of his perfect familiarity with the German tongue. It was at another of these private conferences of the representatives of the various branches of the Anglican Communion, that the action of the American Church, in many of its Dioceses, memorializing the General Convention for the removal of the *filioque* from the Nicene creed, was brought prominently to the notice of the English theologians in speeches by the two secretaries of the Convention; exciting, particularly in the mind of the learned Canon of St. Paul's, the gravest apprehensions as to the claim thus in effect set up by the American Church, of being autonomous. Forgetful that the Mother Church had communicated to us the succession after our rejection of the "Creed of Athanasius;" and, in fact, when the use or disuse of the Nicene Creed was hanging in an almost even balance, and when the omission of a clause of the Apostles' Creed was further allowed by the radical innovators of the period of the American Church's organization; Dr. Liddon took exception, both in the private session and on the floor of the Conference, to the removal of a confessedly interpolated expression in the Nicene Creed, which was a bar to union with the East, and, in this country at least, a means of impairing confidence in the faith itself. It was in his opinion within the province only of an Ecumenical Council thus to rectify an acknowledged wrong; and even the pertinent inquiry as to the probability or even the possibility of such a Council in this age of the Church, failed to effect more than an unwilling modification of his original proposition—that the Western representatives present should agree to a statement which pledged them definitely to the perpetual retention of the *filioque*. The previous action of the American Church, whether right or wrong, precluded the acceptance of such a pledge by the Americans present; and their refusal secured the modification of the

Anglican proposal to which we have referred. It is but due to the learned Canon of St. Paul's to add that his aversion to the removal of the *filioque*, shared, as it afterwards appeared, neither by all his fellow theologians nor by the Old Catholics,¹ arose from a fear that its removal would prove a stumbling block to believing souls at the West, as giving "the impression that God had not actually revealed a relation of the Son to the eternal procession of the Holy Spirit from the Father."

It would be but a repetition of names and arguments with which the reader is now thoroughly familiar to proceed in detail with the narrative of the proceedings of the Conference day after day. The work was now practically confined to the committee; and in the informal meetings of the Anglicans at the Bishop of Gibraltar's rooms, the topics discussed in secret session were reported and reviewed with unflagging patience and zealous determination to attain the truth. One incident, the appearance of Dr. Philip Schaff, of New York, on the floor of the Conference deserves notice. In a speech listened to with evident impatience the Doctor pronounced it "a bold undertaking to wish to settle in a few hours the strife of a thousand years, which to-day yet parts the two greatest Church Communities into two hostile camps," and, after proposing to ignore the authority of the Fathers in the question under discussion, offered the following proposition as a basis of agreement :

"We believe and confess in agreement with the Sacred Scriptures that the Holy Spirit 'proceeds from the Father,' 'and is sent by the Father and the Son.' (St. John xiv. : 26; xv. : 26; xvi. : 7), and that this scriptural truth is sufficient as the substance of a dogma and a basis of Church Union."

The patience of the President had never failed him before, but

¹ It is almost unnecessary to add that the Orientals, and especially the learned Archbishop Lycurgus, strongly repudiated, in the private sessions of the committee, the notion that it required an Ecumenical Council to expunge the *Filioque*. It is not too much to say that the presence of the Americans at this Conference, few in number though they were, and though lacking the presence of a member of the Episcopal order, availed to prevent the opposite view, maintained with great ability and determination by the leading English Theologian from proving a stumbling block in any further progress in the work of reunion.

with a most expressive gesture he remarked, that if these were the views of the Conference, its members would have been more usefully employed at home; and Dr. Langdon most happily allayed the evident indignation of the meeting at this intrusive speech by calling the assembly to remember the need of general prayer on behalf of the committee that God the Holy Ghost might be especially with them while they discussed the mystery of His outgoing.

One other matter already referred to demands our attention ere we proceed to sum up the work accomplished at the Conference. I allude to the noble utterance of Dr. Von Döllinger respecting Anglican Orders. In a matter of so much interest we give his words, wishing that it were possible to reproduce in our readers' minds the convincing impression made by his singularly effective and earnest address.

I desire, according to an understanding with the gentlemen from the East, to say some words on the question of the validity of the Anglican Orders which has been already spoken of in the former year.

The English Church, in the Sixteenth Century, completed its Reformation without renouncing the Ancient Episcopal Constitution. Under Queen Elizabeth, Parker was consecrated Archbishop of Canterbury, and the historical controversy turns upon the question whether his consecration was valid. Into this controversy, all manner of trifling things have been drawn, and it has, from strange motives, been thrown into confusion. The fact that Parker was consecrated by four validly consecrated Bishops, *ritus et legitimate*, by laying on of hands and the words which are to be regarded as essential, is confirmed by such ample testimony, that one, if he should doubt these facts, could with the same right doubt one hundred thousand facts; or, as some one, after the appearance of the *Life of Jesus* by Strauss, has done in derision, could represent the history of the first Napoleon as a myth. The fact is as well attested as can be desired for any fact. Bossuet has acknowledged the validity of Parker's consecration, and no critical historian can dispute it. Ordinations of the Romish Church could be impugned with more show of justice. Besides the re-ordinations of the Tenth Century, the following may, in this view, be recollectcd.

At Florence, a peculiar formula of belief was drawn up in the first instance for the Armenians, with the pretended assent of the Council, which was nevertheless properly at an end. In this so-named *Decretum pro Armeniis*, the doctrine of the Seven Sacraments is especially developed for the instruction of the Orientals; it is the only detailed statement of the kind before the time of the Trent Council. There is found there in regard to ordination the perfectly astonishing declaration that, the matter of this Sacrament is—not the laying on of hands, which is not even mentioned, but—the *porrectio instrumentorum*, the delivery of the chalice and the paten. The form also is inexact, drawn out at great length. This decree was to be forced upon the Orientals. Clement VIII. even ordered the Orientals to observe this decree in regard to

the Sacraments. And yet the *porrectio instrumentorum* is purely a ceremony, and, in truth, such a one as first arose after the year 1000, and only in the West. How would it be now if bishops, on the ground of this decree, should have viewed the laying on of hands, which is essential to the validity of ordination, as a mere ceremony, and should have discontinued it.

The English theologians have only right energetically to hold this *Decretum pro Armeniis* before the Romish theologians in England, who attack the validity of the Anglican ordinations, and remind them that those who live in glass houses should not throw stones.

At a later sitting the venerable President returned to this subject as follows:

In reference to my explanation on Anglican orders, I have heard the objection: though all may be correct which I have said of the historical facts, yet nevertheless the validity of the Anglican and American orders will be always at least doubtful, because the question may be asked, whether the English and American Church recognizes the sacramental character of ordination.

Many misunderstandings arise from the fact the same words can be taken in different significations. An Anglican can answer the question, "Do you esteem orders a sacrament?" with both "Yes" and "No." The English Church uses the word "sacrament" in another sense than the Roman Catholic Church the word *sacramentum* and the Greek the word *μαρτύριον*. The English Church names "sacraments" only those actions which have been ordained by Christ for the communication of grace to all believers. Whether this limitation of the conception is justifiable may be left undecided. But when the word is taken in this narrower sense, the English Church must omit in its creeds and liturgical books ordination in the enumeration of its sacraments, because it is appointed only for certain persons, not, like Baptism and the Eucharist, for all. The word is of no consequence; what conception the Anglicans connect with the word "sacrament," and whether they name ordination a "sacrament," is to the Orientals indifferent. The important thing is, that, in ordination, laying on of hands be used, that the words besides uttered in which the communication of the grace of orders is expressed, and that it be assumed there is conveyed through ordination a grace of the Holy Spirit. In this respect, English ordination can not be questioned.

I have already mentioned that the validity of Roman Catholic ordinations can perhaps be questioned with more appearance of justice. If so great ignorance had not prevailed, the *Decretum pro Armeniis* mentioned day before yesterday must alone have sufficed to hinder the declaration of Infallibility; for here undoubtedly a Pope has erred in a solemn dogmatic decree, in that he has marked the unessential ceremony of the *porrectio instrumentorum* as the essential in ordination, and not mentioned the essential laying on of hands. Actually, indeed, laying on of hands is retained in Roman Catholic ordinations; but, in the foregoing century, it was declared from Rome that ordinations held in a French diocese were invalid, and to be repeated because the *porrectio instrumentorum* had been omitted."

Sunday intervened, and the opportunity of attending the Old

Catholic Service in the Chapel of the University was improved by a large number of the Orientals and Anglicans alike. The noticeable feature in the congregation was the predominance of men—a spectacle unusual on the Continent in Romish places of worship—and the favorable impression made at the outset by this complexion of the audience was confirmed by their devout participation in the service, and their rapt attention to the Preacher's homily. At the English services, held in the same place and without the removal of any of the ecclesiastical "ornaments" of the Old Catholic worship—even the large crucifix remaining untouched on the pulpit—the Bishop of Gibraltar preached, and the Holy Communion was administered to a large number of the faithful. At this service and at that later in the day there were many Old Catholics and Orientals in attendance as interested spectators.

The following day witnessed the close of this interesting meeting. I cannot tell the result in other words than those of the President, whose very tone of voice and the play of his striking features expressed the joy with which he spoke. It was at the end of six days of ceaseless intellectual exertion, and yet this wonderful man seemed unwearied with his labors and was only solicitous that every one should share his satisfaction with the agreement which had been attained. He spoke as follows:

"The result of the continued conferences of the commission chosen by you is an agreement which far exceeds my hopes, which I have cherished on my way hither. With regard to the main matter we are one. The conviction has forced itself during the conferences, at least upon us of the West, that, in the essence of the thing, in relation to that which should be an article of faith, an actual agreement exists. Also the Orientals here present partake for themselves this conviction, and we are permitted to hope that the authorities of their churches will agree with them.

We have formulated our consent in the words of John of Damascus. We have chosen him on the following grounds: he stands at the end of the whole chain of patristic tradition; he has put together in short compass the doctrine of the old Church on the Trinity, the Incarnation, etc., and the result of theological development till the council of the year 680; he has, about 750, composed the first complete textbook of the theology of the fathers, especially the Greek fathers. Experience has shown that we have rightly done in placing ourselves on the ground of John of Damascus. We have united on the six Articles, which I will presently read. With regard to the third article, the Orientals had reserved to themselves the definite declaration; but they will now assent to the same without reserve when to this third article there are added a further citation from John of Damascus, to be named iately read, and to

the introductory proposition, the words "in the sense of the doctrine of the old, undivided Church," against which, on our side, there is nothing to allege.

The articles run thus:

We accept the doctrine of St. John of Damascus on the Holy Ghost, as the same is expressed in the following paragraphs, in the sense of the doctrine of the old, undivided Church:¹

The Holy Ghost goes forth out of the Father (*ἐκ τοῦ πατρός* as the Beginning (*ἀρχῆ*), the Cause (*αἰτία*), the Source (*πηγή*) of the Godhead. (*De recta sententia* n. 1. *Contra Manich.* n. 4.)

2. The Holy Ghost goes not forth out of the Son (*ἐκ τοῦ Υἱοῦ*), because there is in the Godhead but one Beginning (*ἀρχῆ*), one cause (*αἰτία*), through which all that is in the Godhead is produced. (*De fide orthod.* I, 8: *ἐκ τοῦ Υἱοῦ δὲ τὸ Πνεῦμα οὐ λέγομεν, Πνεῦμα δὲ Υἱοῦ ὀνομάζουμεν.*)

3. The Holy Ghost goes forth out of the Father through the Son. *De fide orthod.* I, 12: *τὸ δὲ πνεῦμα τὸ ἄγιον ἐκφαντορικὴ τοῦ κρυφοῖς τῆς θεότητος δύναμις τοῦ πατρὸς, ἐπατρός μὲν δὲ νιοῦ ἐκπορευομένη.* *Ibidem*: *νιοῦ δὲ πνεῦμα, οὐχ ἐξ αὐτοῦ, ἀλλ' ὡς δὲ αὐτοῦ ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς ἐκπορεύμενον; c. Manich. n. 5: διὰ τοῦ λόγου αὐτοῦ ἐξ αὐτοῦ τὸ πνεῦμα αὐτοῦ ἐκπορεύμενον.* *De Hymno Trisag.* n. 28: *πνεῦμα τὸ ἄγιον ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς διὰ τοῦ νιοῦ καὶ λόγου προιόν.*

*Hom. in Sabb. s. n. 4: τοῦτ' ἡμῖν ἔστι τὸ λατρευόμενον . . . πνεῦμα ἄγιον τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ Πατρός, ὡς ἐξ αὐτοῦ ἐκπορεύμενον, διπερ καὶ τον Υἱον λέγεται, ὡς δὲ αὐτον φανερόμενον καὶ τῷ κτίσει μεταδόμενον, ἀλλ' οὐκ ἐξ αὐτοῦ ξαν τὴν ὑπαρξιν.*²

4. The Holy Ghost is the Image of the Son, who is the Image of the Father (*De fide orthod.* I, 13: *εἰκὼν τον πατρός ὁ νιός, καὶ τον νιοῦ τὸ πνεῦμα*), going forth out of the Father and resting in the Son as the force beaming forth from Him. (*De fide orthod.* I, 7: *τοῦ πατρὸς προερχομένη καὶ ἐν τῷ λόγῳ ανατανομένην καὶ αὐτοῦ οὐναν ἐκφαντικὴν δύναμιν.* *Ibidem*, I, 12: *πατήρ . . . διὰ λόγου προβολεῖς ἐκφαντορικὴν πνεύματος.*)

5. The Holy Ghost is the personal Production out of the Father, belonging to the Son, but not out of the Son, because he is the Spirit of the Mouth of the Godhead, which speaks forth the Word. (*De Hymno Trisag.* n. 28: *τὸ πνεῦμα ἐνυπόστατον ἐκπόρευμα καὶ πρόβλημα ἐκ πατρὸς μὲν, νιοῦ δὲ, καὶ μὴ ἐξ νιοῦ, ὡς πνεῦμα στόματος Θεού, λόγου ἐξαγγελτικόν.*)

6. The Holy Ghost forms the mediation between the Father and the Son, and is bound together to the Father through the Son. (*De fide orthod.*, I, 13: *μέσον τον αγεννήτον καὶ γεννήτον καὶ δι νιοῦ τῷ πατρὶ συναπτόμενον.*)

So far, therefore, we are one, and theologians know the question of the Holy Ghost is therewith exhausted; a dogmatical opposition is consequently, in reference to this question, no more between us. God grant that that which we have here agreed upon may be accepted in the churches of the East in the spirit of peace and of dis-

¹ The words, "in the sense of the doctrine of the old, undivided Church," are, in accordance with the remark made above, added.

² The citation from *Hom. in Sabb. s.* was added as supplemental by the Orientals on the morning of the last day of the Conference to enable them to accept this article.

inction between dogma and theological opinion. What we have accomplished gives us new ground for hope that our efforts will be blessed by God, and that we shall be yet more successful, whilst the spirit of the earlier union transactions creates the impression that the blessing of God has not rested upon them. I think that it is not rash to believe that here we see the blessing of God, there His malediction. Let us only remember how at Lyons and Florence, illusion, deceit, a complication of falsifications, the lust of tyrannical power were employed: how both parties always had the consciousness of having something else specially in view than agreement in the great truths of Christian faith. I hope we will be able in the next year, to continue these international conferences. What joy if then the Orientals can proclaim to us: our bishops, synods and churches have assented to our agreement!"

No one with the slightest theological attainments can read this formula without the conviction that something real was accomplished by the patient discussion of this deep and mysterious subject. That such a perfect accord should have been attained was hardly to have been expected at the outset. Indeed, we may note as the turning point of the discussion the eloquent appeal of Bishop Reinkens, at the close of the third conference, for mutual forbearance; and the broad basis of agreement laid down by the Archpriest Janyschew, in the speech directly following the Bishop's earnest words. These propositions were as follows:

"1. The Godhead, the divine attributes, the divine Being, are the same in all three divine Persons. In this point of view, any separation whatsoever between the Father and the Holy Ghost can as little be asserted as a separation between the Son and the Holy Ghost. In that we are all one.

2. The special property of the first Person is this, that He alone is the *πατής, ἀρτία,* or *ἀρχή,* as well of the Son as of the Holy Ghost, and that Himself is *ἀναρχος.* In this sense the two other Persons are the production of the first, the Son through the birth, the Holy Ghost through the procession.

3. The special property of the second Person is, that He is the Son, the Only Begotten, the Logos, who is eternally with God, and is sent, as also the Holy Ghost, into the world.

4. The special property of the third Person, the Holy Ghost, is, that He, according to His existence, goes forth from the Father, according to His operation or manifestation—be it in eternity, be it in time—not only from the Father, but also from the Son."

Following this happy beginning Dr. Von Döllinger at the opening of the seventh Conference announced the agreement of the Committee on the following fundamental principles:

"1. We agree in the reception of the Ecumenical creeds, and of the determinations of faith of the old undivided Church.

2. We agree in the acknowledgment that the addition of the *Filioque* to the Creed did not take place in an ecclesiastically legitimate way.
3. We own on all sides the statement of the doctrine of the Holy Spirit, as it has been presented by the fathers of the undivided Church.
4. We reject every representation and every mode of expression in which any acceptance whatsoever of two principles or *ἀρχαὶ* or *ἀρτία* in the Trinity is contained."

Thus we have the documentary history of the mode by which the final result was attained.

Nothing remained but the parting words of the President, in which he discussed the Romish view of Purgatory, dating the origin of that error to the beginning of the seventh century, and passing into an eloquent review of the state of the religious world. Of this comprehensive address, a single paragraph, pertinent because relating to our own land, must suffice :

"Turn we now our views to another part of the world. America is divided into a Latin, Spanish-Portuguese, and an Anglo-Saxon half. In this exists a great Protestant State. Certainly there are in the United States six to seven millions of Roman Catholic inhabitants, mostly from Ireland. But the number of the Catholics is much reduced through the influence of American Protestantism. The Irish themselves estimate the loss which Catholicism has suffered through the Protestant education of the children of Catholic parents at three millions. Less numerous than the Irish are the Catholic Germans, and they assimilate themselves in the second or third generation rather to the American Protestants than to the Irish. I do not believe that the situation of the Catholics in North America will essentially form itself more favorably, although their Church there enjoys all the freedom which they can desire, with the exception, indeed, of the one freedom which she specially prizes of being permitted to suppress with force the Heterodox. The Catholics in the United States do not form a significant and influential element; they contribute as good as nothing to the intellectual cultivation and to the intellectual life of the nation. Therefore, Roman Catholicism, I believe, will win there, in the long run, no power and no political influence."

Adding the expression of his longing for the realization of Christ's prayer for the union of His followers, that the world might be converted to Christianity, the farewell words were spoken, coupled with urgent invitations to the meeting of the Conference the following year. The Archbishop of Syra and Tenos responded for his Oriental co-religionists, and the Bishop of Gibraltar for the Anglicans, after which Bishop Reinkens recited the *Te Deum*, with the whole assembly standing, and the *Pater Noster*, to which the Bishop added as follows :

"Dabis autem nobis omne bonum, in primis quod nunc maxime desideramus, pacis bonum inter ecclesias, pacis quidem in veritate. Confirm et sanctifica nos in veritate. Sermo Tuus est veritas. Conserua nos quoque, sive ex Oriente, sive ex Occidente venientes, ad te caritatis vinculo semper conjunctos. Et benedicas nos, Deus omnipotens, Pater et Filius et Spiritus Sanctus. Amen.

It would be unwise to hazard predictions as to the results of this gathering of members of the various Churches of Christendom at Bonn. It was but natural that the proceedings there should have been on the one hand studiously misrepresented, and on the other dismissed with superecilious contempt. The organs of Rome, and the "Times;" the "Pall Mall Gazette," and "Westminster Review;" the prevailing indifferentism and rampant Ultramontanism, for once met on common ground. It was but an illustration of the words of the far-seeing Von Döllinger in his "Lectures on the Re-union of the Churches,"¹ published years before. "At the beginning of any eirenic movement, its opponents will outnumber its friends and helpers." But the work has advanced since the friendly leave-takings on the Rhine bank that bright August evening in 1875. Already, the tone and temper of the Eastern Church authorities toward the Anglican Churches has been materially changed. The opposition of the Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol to any plans of inter-communion with the Easterns has been significantly rebuked by the signatures of Bishops and Clergy, nobles and men of all ranks and callings to the address of thanks to Dr. Von Döllinger from members of the Mother Church. Even the trenchant letter of Dr. Pusey, which at the first threatened to impair confidence in the Bonn resolutions, has been modified and its force destroyed by a later communication practically abandoning the ground earlier assumed. Even in Convocation, both in that of Canterbury and York, the interest shown in the Bonn proceedings, and in the old Catholic movements as a step in the direction of a return to unity, has been marked and encouraging. There are still misconceptions to correct and difficulties to be removed, not only in the various Churches of a divided Christendom abroad, but at home. No one need fear that the unofficial representatives of either the English or American Churches

Oxenham's translation, London, 1872, p 161.

at Bonn sought, or would for a moment support, any measures tending towards the subordination of their respective Churches or the surrender of their Church doctrines to Romish or Oriental assumption or error. The effort was not for Church comprehension, but for that mutual good understanding, recognition and inter-communion compatible with that measure of diversity which would naturally be expected of autonomous Churches of various races and with varying traditions received from the past. It was believed that with much diversity on confessedly minor points, and without seeking to make Occidentals of Orientals, or Anglicans of Old Catholics, or *vice versa*, there might be attained in God's good time and way, and solely on the basis of God's immutable truth, the closer, and, in fact, the full realization of the high-priestly prayer of our Lord Jesus Christ. The baptised throughout the world might and should be in visible fellowship one with another, and each alike with Christ the Church's Head. To effect even the beginnings of unity there must be found some starting point, and we believe it has been found in an agreement confessedly existing, since, to quote the words of the "English Church Quarterly Review":¹

"The Eastern Church, the Anglican and the Old Catholics are all agreed on three fundamental questions, the Constitution of the Christian Church, the authority of the first six Ecumenical Councils, and the necessity of believing in the Catholic Faith as propounded in the Creed and interpreted by the Fathers of undivided Christendom."

This is, historically, the American Church's ground. At Lambeth, in 1867, the Anglican Episcopate affirmed the authority of the six Ecumenical Councils. The Episcopal Constitution of the Church is affirmed in the indispensable requirement of Episcopal ordination for ministering at our altars; and the recognition of the Fathers of the Church as giving us the Catholic Faith might be supported by a *catena* from the works of Reformers and Doctors of the Anglican Church from the earliest days of that Church's return to primitive faith and purity. It was in accordance with these principles that the first re-union Conference, in 1874, agreed upon a series of propositions which have received well nigh universal approbation. They have been spread again and again be-

¹ Vol. 1, p 388.

fore the theological world, and from that basis of agreement the work has gone on. God grant it may increase more and more.

“The fruits of unity,” says Lord Bacon,¹ “(next to the well-pleasing of God, which is all in all) are two: the one towards them that are without the Church, the other towards those that are within.” These “fruits of Unity” are shadowed forth in the words of our Lord’s last prayer. Towards those who are without the Church, the unity of Christendom will bring the conviction that Christ’s mission was Divine. “As for the fruit towards those that are within,” continues Bacon, “it is peace, which containeth infinite blessings; it establisheth faith; it kindleth charity.” We may well remember this; and we who day after day, year after year, with but shadowy longings and with but little faith have put up the prayer that “all who profess and call themselves Christians may be led into the way of truth and hold the faith in unity of spirit and in the bond of peace;” and have besought our God “to inspire continually the Universal Church with the spirit of truth, unity and concord,” may be pardoned if in this wonderful drawing together of members of long alienated divisions of Christendom we begin to hope that Christ’s prayer has been heard: “Neither pray I for these alone but for them also which shall believe on Me through their word; that they all may be one; as Thou, Father, art in Me, and I in Thee, that they also may be one in Us; that the world may believe that Thou hast sent Me.”

WILLIAM STEVENS PERRY.

¹ Essays, Ess. III.

NEALE AND LITTLEDALE ON THE PSALMS.

"If we keep vigil," says S. John Chrysostom, "in the Church, David comes first, last and midst. If early in the morning we seek for the melody of hymns, first, last and midst is David again. If we are occupied with the funeral solemnities of the departed, if virgins sit at home and spin, David is first, last and midst. O marvellous wonder! Many who have made but little progress in literature, nay, who have scarcely mastered its first principles, have the Psalter by heart. Nor is it in cities and churches alone that at all times, through every age, David is illustrious. In the midst of the forum, in the wilderness, and uninhabitable land, he excites the praises of God. In monasteries, amongst those holy choirs of angelic armies, David is first, midst and last. In the convent of virgins, where are the bands of them that imitate Mary; in the deserts, where are men crucified to this world, and having their conversation with God, first, midst and last is he. All other men are at night overpowered by natural sleep: David alone is active; and, congregating the servants of God into seraphic bands, turns earth into Heaven, and converts men into angels."

It is with this beautiful quotation from S. Chrysostom that Dr. Neale begins his *Commentary on the Psalms*,¹ a commentary which, as completed by his intimate friend Dr. Littledale, is unique in our day, amid the multitude of works devoted to the marvellous collection of sacred songs known to us as "The Psalms." If the Psalms were merely ancient writings in a language remote

¹A *COMMENTARY ON THE PSALMS*: from Primitive and Mediæval writers; and from the various Office-books and Hymns of the Roman, Mozarabic, Ambrosian, Gallican, Greek, Coptic, Armenian and Syriac Rites. By the Rev. J. M. Neale, D. D., some time Warden of Sackville College, East Grinstead; and the Rev. R. F. Littledale, LL. D., sometime Scholar of Trinity College, Dublin. Third Edition. London: Joseph Masters & Co., 78 New Bond street.

from modern use, if they were only like the records now deciphered from the burnt-brick library of Sardanapalus, then the mode so prevalent with modern writers would be the true one. It would be all-important to know the exact meaning of every word at the time it was originally written, as interpreted by the circumstances of that age, and that alone. But the Psalms, though originally written in what is called a dead language, have been the least dead of all the words that have ever been written. They have never been buried out of the sight and knowledge of men under the rubbish of three thousand years of total ignorance. More than even the Gospels, they have been perpetually alive upon the tongues and in the hearts of unnumbered millions of Christians, as of countless thousands of pious Jews before the coming of Christ. They have been woven into the very warp and woof of the clothing of the King's daughter. As Dr. Neale beautifully says of the Church, "The love, the veneration, the delight which she has ever expressed for the Psalter, have almost turned it into a part of her own being." And even our own branch of the Apostolic Church, though less ardent in its temper of devotion, gives the same practical preponderance to the Psalms; for, while in her daily services she orders the Old Testament to be read nearly through once in a year, and the New Testament two or three times, the entire Psalter is to be used no less than *twelve* times.

Dr. Neale's idea, then, was to form a commentary, not made up of modern speculations upon remote antiquities, but gathered together from the richest treasures of the Church's continuous and living *use* of the Psalter, as the chief element in her ordinary worship, throughout all the ages. The "spirit of the Psalter permeates and kindles every other part of the Church's service. Its principal features have received a new and conventional character, have been transfigured from the worship of the Synagogue to that of the Church." Or, "to use the mediæval metaphor, the trumpets of the Tabernacle have given place to the Psaltery and the New Song of the Christian ritual." Dr. Neale, therefore, assures us "that scarcely any of the interpretations given" are his own. "They have every one been handed down to us," he says, "with greater or less authority; they have been taught to many genera-

tions of those to whom every sentence of the Psalms was a household word ; and when they shall appear most strange and most fanciful, the reader will do well to remember that the life-long study, not of an individual, but, if I may use the expression, of the Church, directed to one subject, is likely to disclose mysteries, and to develop beauties, which cursory perusals would utterly fail to discover." The margin of the whole commentary, therefore, gives us the initials or names of the authors, liturgies or hymns, from whose treasures the text is made up.

But it will be impossible to give any adequate idea of this exquisite mosaic without some examples. We select, *ad aperturam libri*, Ps. xviii. 28: "Thou also shalt light my candle: the LORD my God shall make my darkness to be light." (We omit the marginal references.) :

My candle. It is beautifully said: for, like a candle, no true servant of God can shine without at the same time consuming. "He was a burning and a shining light;" but the burning first, and then the shining. Or take it of the faith of the Church: a light kindled upon her—a light that it over and over again seems as if some blast of temptation would extinguish—a light, if small in itself, the faith as a grain of mustard seed, yet sending out its beams far and near in the darkness of this world. *Thou also shalt*—when none else can; and notice, too, how here, as so often, the Psalmist begins with speaking of God, and ends with speaking to Him. So the Bride in the Canticles, "Let HIM kiss me with the kisses of His mouth, for Thy love is better than wine." *Shall make my darkness to be light.* So also the promise: "Who is there among you that . . . walketh in darkness, and hath no light? Let him trust in the name of the LORD, and stay himself upon his GOD." . . . *My darkness to be light.* Shall we take it of the darkness of that night and of that garden when they came to seek Him with lanterns, and torches, and weapons? Or of that darkness which was over all the earth from the sixth hour until the ninth hour? Or rather of that darkness—a darkness which might be felt—which came in even to our LORD's soul, and attained its most fearful blackness when He uttered that cry, "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?" However we take it, if never such darkness to precede, never such brightness to follow. "At the brightness of that light," says the Eastern Church, "let the heavens rejoice, let the earth be glad; because the LORD hath showed strength with His arm, hath trampled down death by death, hath become the first-begotten from the dead, hath dispersed the darkness of Hell, and hath poured glorious brilliancy on the world." And notice how beautifully the description in the text rises. In this world, after all, our faith, our knowledge of God, are but as a candle; it remains for the next world to do away with these shadows for ever, to bring the light of happy morning after the dark and sad night, *The Lord my God shall make my darkness to be light.*

To all this Dr. Littledale adds, in the last edition :

The Targum expounds this verse of exiled Israel, whose candle was indeed quenched in captivity, but to be kindled again by Him Who is the Light of Israel, making His people see the consolations for the righteous in the world to come. Many of the Western commentators see here the Apostles, Martyrs, and early preachers of the Gospel, who are the light of the world, bright with the knowledge and warm with the love of God, and dispersing the darkness of heathenism. Others again will have it that man's heart or intellect is the *lantern* or *candle* (as it is written, "The spirit of man is the candle of the LORD") to be enlightened by grace. And yet once more, a holy writer bids us look from the darkness of this world to the glory to be revealed in the Heavenly Country.

There no cloud or passing vapor
 Dims the brightness of the air;
 Endless noonday, glorious noonday,
 From the Sun of suns is there:
 There night needs not rest from labor,
 For unknown are toil and care.

Let us try another random example, Ps. xix. 3: "There is neither speech nor language: but their voices are heard among them."

We may take the verse in two senses: either, no *speech nor language* among the nations of the earth to which these voices did not go forth; which must be the sense if we refer the clause to the Apostles; or, no real speech in the preaching of the stars, and yet their language is intelligible to all nations. The great Portuguese theologian, Vieyra, referring to this verse, says, "The most ancient preacher in the world is the sky. If the sky be a preacher, it must have sermons, and it must have words. So it has, says David. And what are these sermons and words of the sky? The words are the stars; the sermons, their composition, order, harmony and cause. * * * The stars are very distinct and very clear; so must the style of preaching be. And have no fear that on this account it should appear low. What loftier than the sermons of the heavens? The style may be clear enough, and yet lofty enough too; so clear, that the illiterate may understand it; so deep, that the philosopher may learn from it. In the stars, the countryman finds instruction for his labor; the seaman for his navigation, the mathematician for his observation; so that the husbandman and sailor, who cannot read, can yet understand the stars, and the philosopher who has read every book that ever was written, cannot fathom their meaning."

We cannot resist the temptation to give a part of the comment on verses 5 and 6 of the same Psalm, "In them hath he set a tabernacle for the sun," etc :

* * * * As they who go out to war dwell not in houses, but in tabernacles or tents, so our LORD, going forth to His war with Satan, dwelt in the tabernacle of His flesh while he entered into the conflict with, and overcame, His enemy. *Which cometh*

forth as a Bridegroom out of his chamber. And here none ever failed to see the LORD's entrance into the world from the womb of Mary. The Bridegroom, hereafter, to be betrothed to the Church on the Cross, came forth, as it were, in the morning of that day of which the sufferings of Calvary were the evening. "That Eternal Light," says S. John Damascene, "which, proceeding from the Co-eternal Light, had His existence before all worlds, came forth corporeally from the Virgin Mary, as it were a Bridegroom from His chamber." *And rejoiceth as a giant.* They go back far for the full solution of this mystery. It was from the union of the Sons of God with the daughters of men that those ancient giants sprang, who may thus properly be called of "twofold substance." Like them, it was the twofold nature of our LORD which enabled Him to accomplish the work of our redemption, and thus this word "giant," in itself sets forth to us the whole scheme of salvation. "I see," says S. Proclus, "His miracles, and I proclaim His Deity; I behold His sufferings, and I deny not His humanity. Emmanuel opened the gates of nature as man, but burst not the bars of Virginity as God. So came He forth from the womb of Mary as by a word He entered; so was He born as He was conceived; without human passion He entered; without human corruption He came forth." S. Ambrose explains more fully the type of the giant. "Him, holy David, the prophet, describes as a giant, because He, being one, is *yet* double, and of twofold nature: partaker both of the Divinity and of a body: Who, like a Bridegroom proceeding out of His chamber, rejoiced as a giant to run his course. The Bridegroom of the soul, as the WORD; the Giant of the earth, because performing all the offices of our nature. Being eternal God, He undertook the Sacrament of the Incarnation." So in another hymn.

The offspring of the Mighty Divine,
He issued from a Virgin shrine,
Bridegroom, Redeemer, Stablisher,
And Giant of His Church.

"I came forth from the FATHER, and am come into the world; again, I leave the world and go unto the Father." Would you know, asks S. Gregory, the steps by which He thus came? From Heaven into the womb; from the womb to the cradle; from the cradle to the Cross; from the Cross to the sepulchre; from the sepulchre He returned to Heaven. Behold, that He might cause us to follow Him, He took these steps, that we might be able to say from our very hearts, "Draw me, we will run after Thee." And see the depth of the mystery in the sign that was given to Hezekiah. The shadow went backward ten degrees, by which degrees it had gone on; thus the LORD humbled Himself below the nine orders of angels, being "made a little lower than the angels," to the tenth degree, namely, man, before His glorified humanity took its place on the Right Hand of the FATHER. And see how beautifully those two are joined: *He runneth about unto the end of it again, and there is nothing hid from the heat thereof.* Because He whom we love has now ascended into Heaven, therefore it is that our hearts burn within us, while we think of the glory which is His, and which is to be ours. *Nothing hid from the heat thereof,* for that Ascension—for that land—pertain no less to ourselves than to the angels:

O common joy, O common boast,
To us and that celestial Host!
To them, that He regains the sky;
To us, that He to us is nigh.

Let us turn to a passage in Ps. viii., which ordinary readers interpret only in the literal sense; and yet the Epistle to the Hebrews shows us that the true interpretation of this Psalm refers to Christ, and therefore the Church orders it to be read on **Ascension Day**, thus fixing its meaning as setting forth His kingly exaltation at the Right Hand of the Father. What then is the true significance of "all sheep and oxen, yea, and the beasts of the field: the fowls of the air, and the fishes of the sea?"

All sheep. By sheep we understand those whose business in CHRIST'S Church is not to teach, but to learn. "My sheep," saith He, "hear My voice." By oxen, those who labor in His word and doctrine; according to that saying of S. Paul, "Thou shalt not muzzle the mouth of the ox that treadeth out the corn." For by these great profit is obtained in His Church; as it is written, "Much increase is made by the strength of the ox." Yea, the word shows that a change of subject is made; namely, from the good to the wicked. *The beasts of the field:* those who own no master, but follow their own heart's lusts, like "brute beasts," as S. Peter teaches, "made to be taken and destroyed." For the wicked, as well as the good, are made subject to CHRIST. * * *

The fowls of the air are the saints, who rise above the world, but only by means of the sign of the Cross. The *fishes*, ordinary Christians, regenerate of water and of the HOLY GHOST; and whatsoever, bad as well as good, unholy no less than holy, walketh through the paths of the sea, is exposed to the waves and storms of this troublesome world.

With such an interpretation there is a noble fulness of meaning in the closing exclamation, "O LORD, our Governor, how excellent is Thy Name in all the world!"

Here is another chance opening of the Book, at Psalm xxxiii. 2: "Praise the LORD with harp; sing praises unto Him with the lute and instrument of ten strings."

Here we have the first mention of musical instruments in the Psalms. It is to be observed that the early Fathers, almost with one accord, protest against their use in Churches; as they are forbidden in the Eastern Church to this day, where yet, by the consent of all, the singing is infinitely superior to anything that can be heard in the West. It is not easy to determine when they were first introduced into the West. S. Gregory the Great speaks of organs, but Amalarus, in the eighth (?) ninth century, describing the use of the Church of France, says that no instruments were employed. S. Thomas Aquinas seems to disapprove them, or at least barely tolerates them; and the Church of Lyons, which held more faithfully to primitive practice than any other in France, admitted them only in the sixteenth century. To what perfection they were brought among the Jews the whole routine of the Temple service abundantly shows. The *instrument of ten strings* they take to mean the music of the Church

Triumphant, ten being the symbol of perfection. * * * * Topologically, all mediæval writers dwell on the similarity between the strings of musical instruments and Christian souls. Firstly, they are made of dead animals—so must we be dead to sins. Next, they require an equal tension, as our passions must be subdued and moderated. Thirdly, as all their sound depends on the air, so all that we can do is to be attributed to the HOLY SPIRIT. Adam of S. Victor sees a parallel between the martyrs and their sufferings, and the strings of the lyre which are drawn tight and stricken so that they may yield their sweetest sound. * * * So, again, Hildegbert of Le Mans:

Sicut chorda solet dare tensa sonum meliorem,
Sic pœnis tensus dat plenum laudis honorem.

[As the chord when at full strain gives forth its note more sweetly,
So the martyr racked with pain gives forth God's praise more meetly.]

Let us now turn to one of the darkest of the Psalms, the 88th, that which the Church appoints for the evening of Good Friday, and which is commonly described as being the only one of all the Psalms in which there is not one ray of joy: "This Psalm stands alone in all the Psalter for the unrelieved gloom, the hopeless sorrow of its tone." In our opinion this is a mistake, and arises from giving to that magnificent trio of questions, "Dost thou show wonders among the dead?" etc., a *negative* answer. But to those who believe the Patristic sense of the article of the Creed, "He descended into hell," it is impossible to give any but the *positive* or *affirmative* answer to these questions. Then we see the wisdom with which this Psalm is selected to be read at the time when we commemorate the great work wrought by the disembodied Spirit of Christ when He "preached to the spirits in prison," when "the Gospel was preached also unto them that are dead." Thus the selection of this Psalm is brought into full harmony with the first lesson for the next morning (Easter Even), "by the blood of thy covenant I have sent forth thy prisoners out of the pit wherein is no water;" and with the Epistle for the same day, which certifies us that Christ "preached unto the spirits in prison, which sometime were disobedient when once the long-suffering of God waited in the days of Noah, while the ark was a preparing." In this last connection, S. Jerome's reading, *Shall the giants arise?* ("There were giants in those days") instead of *shall the dead rise up again?* is very significant. We are rather disappointed that this strongest and fullest meaning of the Psalm is so lightly touched and tenderly alluded to:

For the most part, the expositors pass very lightly over the literal interpretation of these three verses, and prefer to follow S. Augustine in taking them allegorically of those who lie in the grave of sin, and asking what may be God's purpose toward them, whether He have provided any means of reaching and delivering them. In the tenth verse, the second clause * * * S. Jerome's reading, *Shall the giants arise?* is said by S. Augustine to imply that no skill or might of physicians, however gigantic, is enough; and by others, that the words refer to the antediluvian giants or any other, and thus they are explained of peculiarly grievous and obstinate sinners, respecting whose capability of repentance the question is asked. They remind us, too, that the *loving kindness* and *faithfulness* of God are only titles of the **LORD JESUS**, and that He did make His way into the very heart of the grave and of destruction, to show His wondrous work of salvation in the dark of Hades; though there are some found to suggest that the *grave* here means the "open sepulchre" of the tongue of the Pharisees and Chief Priests, and the *land where all things are forgotten*, not merely the abode of the finally lost, but that ungrateful Judea which kept not in mind either the testimonies of the prophets or the marvellous works of the Redeemer Himself, when it cried aloud for His crucifixion.

Our **LORD's** triumphal descent into Hell, though hardly prominent enough in the comment on the 88th Psalm, is, however, beautifully brought out elsewhere. On Psalm cvii. 16: "For He hath broken the gates of brass, and smitten the bars of iron in sunder," we find, among other good things, the following:

The favorite interpretation of the passage is that which has fixed this Psalm for the Matins of Easter Eve in the Ambrosian use; namely, that it tells of the victory over Death and Hell wrought by the passion and resurrection of **CHRIST**, and of His bearing away with Him to Paradise the once imprisoned Patriarchs. And this idea is repeated in more than one hymn. * * * * The simile is often heightened by reference to the history of Samson ending his sleep at Gaza by carrying off the gates, posts, and bars of the city to the hill before Hebron.

And, again, still more strikingly, on the magnificent 24th Psalm: "Lift up your heads, O ye gates, and be ye lift up, ye everlasting doors: and the King of Glory shall come in."

* * * Very great authorities would refer it to our **LORD's** descent into Hell, His bursting the gates of brass, and smiting the bars of iron in sunder. To this the Latin Church would seem to appropriate it, by appointing this Psalm as one of those for the Second Nocturn for Easter Eve, with the antiphon from this verse. S. Epiphanius has a magnificent passage, in which he represents our **LORD** attended by an army of angels, Michael and Gabriel in the fore-ranks, demanding admission at Hell-gate, bursting open the unwilling doors, tearing them from the hinges, casting them forth into the abyss, commanding that they shall never be raised any more. "CHRIST!" he exclaims, "CHRIST, the door, is present; unto God the **LORD**, belong the issues of Death." * * * To the same effect the Eastern Church, on the Great Sabbath,

exclaims: "To-day, Hades groans and cries out, It had been profitable for me if I had never received Him that was born of Mary; for, coming upon me, He hath dissolved my strength, He hath broken the gates of brass; He, as God, hath raised up the souls which I before held. Glory, O LORD, to Thy Cross, and to Thy resurrection! To-day, Hades groans and cries out, my might is dissolved: I receive to myself a mortal, as one of the dead; Him I can in no way have strength to hold, but I lose with Him those over whom I rule; I detain the dead for all ages, but, behold, He raiseth up all. Glory, O LORD, to Thy Cross and to Thy resurrection! Of this day Moses beforehand spoke mystically, as in a type, 'And God blessed the seventh day.' For this is that blessed Sabbath, this is that day of rest, in which the only-begotten Son of God rested from all His works, keeping Sabbath in the flesh, on account of His device which He had devised concerning Death; and returning back again to that which He was by His resurrection, He hath bestowed on us the life which is eternal, as only good, and the lover of men." "Therefore," exclaims Gerhohus, "O infernal princes, at whose persuasion the Innocent One suffered unjustly, now ye must lose even them whom ye appeared to possess by a kind of justice. Away, then, with your gates! Speak no more of the cause which ye seem to have of justly detaining them! Keep silence when He is at hand, in Whom your prince, when He came, found nothing."

Exquisitely beautiful, too, is the interpretation of the dramatic repetition of the sublime challenge of this Ascension Psalm :

There remains but one observation to be made on the repeated demand and reply. In the first, the LORD, victorious over the grave, was ascending into Heaven, alone, so far as human nature was concerned—alone, so far as regards His faithful servants, yet bearing the burden and heat of the day, while He was entering into rest. But now we look forward to the end of the world. And behold, he re-ascends, not now by Himself, but with all the multitude of the redeemed, with all His saints, from the beginning of the world to the last that was written in the Book of Life. Well, therefore, was the reply to the first question, "The LORD, strong and mighty;" for what greater proof of might than the overthrow of Death and Hell? And with equal force the second reply is, *The Lord of hosts, He is the King of Glory*; when it is not a single warrior returning in triumph, but a mighty Chief, followed by the multitude of His victorious soldiers.

The glorious 104th Psalm, one of those appointed for Whitsunday, teems with beauties in the comment, but we can select only that on one verse, the 26th, "There go the ships, and there is that Leviathan: whom thou hast made to take his pastime therein."

These *ships* are the preachers which carry CHRIST into the hearts of men, or the local Churches which pass over the sea amidst storms and tempests, piloted by Christ with the wood of the Cross. And observe, that as the world is the sea, and temptations and persecutions the storms, so if the Church be the ship, the Cross is the mast, faith the sail, good works her yards, the Apostles and doctors her crew, the

HOLY GHOST the favorable wind, the harbor the end of the world, and the country reached, everlasting life. This is that vessel of which we read, "And when He was entered into a ship, His Disciples followed Him," of which it is true that "Except these abide in the ship ye cannot be saved." Every soul that has set out on the voyage for the Happy Isles is like a ship too, whereof some make shipwreck of the faith, and never reach the haven, while others more blessed in their undertaking, come safe to land. And in saying *there* go the ships, we are taught that the way to Heaven must needs be over the waters of baptism. *Leviathan* (translated *dragon* by LXX. and Vulgate) cannot here mean, as it elsewhere does, the fresh-water crocodile, but stands for any sea monster, *taking its pastime* by sporting and playing freely in the waters. But the ambiguity of the Hebrew, reproduced by the Vulgate, makes another reading possible, *whom Thou hast made to sport with him*, a sense borne out by the similar language, "Wilt thou play with him (Leviathan) as with a bird? or wilt thou bind him for thy maidens?" And then the notion will be of the perfect ease with which God deals with the vast bulk of the monster as a mere toy in His hands. There is a wild Jewish tradition that the male leviathan is for three hours daily the plaything of God, while the female, slain to avert the multiplication of such huge creatures, is salted down for the food of Israel in the days of Messiah. * * * Mystically, they take it to mean the Devil, who, in despite of his power and craft, is made a mock of by God, by men and by angels; by God, when suffered to tempt men that they may advance in holiness; by men, whom he often finds stronger, like Job, the more he strives to weaken them; by angels, whom he knows to be fully aware of all the circumstances of his fall. The LXX. rendering of Job xl. 19, speaking of Behemoth, is, "This is the beginning of the creation of the LORD, made to be sported with by the angels;" whence S. Augustine, illustrating the present Psalm, remarks, "Wouldst thou mock the dragon? Be an angel of God. But thou art not yet an angel of God. Until thou be such, if thou do but hold the course towards it, there are angels to mock the dragon, lest he should hurt thee. For the angels of Heaven are set over the powers of the air." And thus, having lost his great power, he is made for a mock, so that any one who has CHRIST for his Head, can trample on the dragon, and bruise the head thereof, by refusing to yield to his suggestions, or to swerve from the right way. And so the Master Himself made a mock of the sea monster, luring him with the bait of Manhood which hid the Hook of Deity, and does so still by daily rescuing sinners from his grasp, through means of repentance.

From the inexhaustible 119th Psalm, which fills 161 pages of this Commentary, we must take one example, on a verse which to the ordinary reader presents no idea at all, or perhaps only a grotesque misconception: "For I am become like a bottle in the smoke: yet do I not forget Thy statutes:"

A bottle, that is, a *wine-skin*. The metaphor is taken from the blackened and shrivelled appearance of a skin exposed to the fire. But one object amongst the ancients of such exposure was to mellow the wine by the gradual ascent of the heat and smoke from the fire over which the skin was suspended: and thus the words

teach us the uses of affliction in ripening and improving the soul. For *smoke* the LXX. and Vulgate read *frost*, and the favorite interpretation based upon this is, the result of bodily austerity and mortification in cooling the hot passions of the flesh. S. Ambrose, coming very near the fullest meaning of the passage, although adopting the version *frost*, observes, "The righteous man, who hath mortified his body, is rightly called a wine-skin, seeing that he is found stripped, yet not naked, for a wine-skin is made of the spoils of a dead animal." Let us then die to sin, that we may live to God. Filled with the spirit of gladness and pleasantness of joy, we shall be spiritual spoils, free from bodily weakness, and holding within us in the unbroken folds of our soul that grace of divine mysteries which has been poured into us. Of these skins it is said that they put new wine into new bottles, who wish to keep both the body and grace. Let not this skin of thine leak, then, nor gape, nor grow decayed from lying on the ground, lest the new wine should burst the old skins, and grace be poured out where the skins are torn. Let them not dry up again with the sun of unrighteousness and the excessive force of heat, but rather let the various passions of the glowing flesh be calmed as though with the cold of snow, a snow which shines with the brightness of God's own word, which they who follow shall in the resurrection have raiment white as snow.

Again, taking snow as the type of earthly affliction due to sin, that "winter" which the LORD bid His disciples pray might not be the season of their flight; the Saint bids us note that we should be as insensible to the influence of sin as a dead skin is to that of cold; because we ought to bear about in our bodies the dying of the LORD JESUS. He then who chastises his body is a skin which maketh drunken not with wine but with the SPIRIT, in which there are no grapes of gall, no poison of dragons, no cruel venom of asps, but that inebriating cup which is so glorious. Others, reminding us of the heat of Eastern lands, suggest that the skin, whether containing water or wine, is placed in snow to cool its contents, on the one hand to prevent evaporation, and on the other to make them more grateful and cooling to the palate, which rejects tepid water with disgust and sickness, but delights in that which is cold. And this sense of affliction making that which is stored within us pleasanter to God and man, comes back to the literal meaning, albeit by a different road. The *yet* of the English versions, though not in the Hebrew, nevertheless seems required to complete the parallelism of the two strophes of the verse; and if we supply it, we must needs follow the translation *smoke*, and not *frost*. For too much heat would dry up and evaporate the contents of a skin; and so it is said "Despite the heat of my affliction, yet do I not forget Thy statutes, because Thou art careful not to try me beyond my strength." But cold would leave the quantity of fluid undiminished, and is thus a less suggestive rendering.

One more example, and we shall then turn to other parts of our subject. In that closing burst of praise, the 150th Psalm, how many are there who see nothing further than a catalogue of the various instruments employed in the temple service? But let us see what "trumpet," "lute," "harp," "cymbals," "dances," "strings," and "pipe" mean in *spiritual* language:

The *trumpet* is the warrior instrument, and either calls to the battle or proclaims a victory. Hence the trumpet praises CHRIST as He is our Captain and King. He is praised by the trumpet-voice of His great preachers, whom He bids "to cry aloud, and spare not, lift up thy voice as a trumpet," whom He sends to compass the walls of the spiritual Jericho to make them totter to their ruin, that the armies of the LORD may go up and take the city.

They thunder—their sound
It is CHRIST the LORD!
Then Satan doth fear,
His citadels fall!
As when the dread trumpets
Went forth at Thy word,
And one long blast shattered
The Canaanite's wall.

The trumpet needs to be held with the hand, and so the preacher must work as well as speak. And whereas the mouthpiece of the trumpet is much smaller than its bell, whence its voice finally issues, we learn the lesson that the preacher ought to be far stricter with himself than with his hearers. The trumpet is also the signal of victory, and thus when the sound of the Archangel's trump shall proclaim the final overthrow of Satan, death, and sin, the Saints will praise the LORD for His triumph.

The *lute* (or *Psaltery*, as LXX. and Vulgate have it), as specially used in religious music, denotes service to God. They take it as the decachord, and remind us that it sounds from above, so that it denotes the glorification of the soul.

The *harp*, a more secular instrument, used at weddings and other festivals, praises CHRIST the Bridegroom, and summons to His marriage-feast. Sounding from below, it praises Him for deliverance from sorrow, and rejoices in the glorification of the body.

Cymbals ought to be (in verse 4), as in A. V., *timbrel*, or *drum*, as LXX. and Vulgate; meaning the small tabret or tambourine played with the hand.

Drums clearly teach how mortal flesh ought to be mortified

In all its members, seeing they are made of dead beasts' hide.

Strained to the wood on every side, dry, and sounding under blows, they serve as a type of the martyrs, and of all who are crucified to the world, uttering praise to God most clearly when most severely afflicted.

And *dances*, or, as LXX. and Vulgate, *choir*, denoting peaceful fellowship, and joint harmonious action, which, S. Gregory reminds us, cannot be safely disregarded by those who play the drum.

Strings, as very thin, and strained with great tension, are types of all those who macerate the body with fasts and vigils, and are tightly fastened by the nails of the Cross, straining upward towards God, and giving forth sweet tones when touched by His fingers.

The *pipe*, or hand-organ, formed of several tubes of unequal length fastened together, signifies the harmonious concord of different graces and virtues, whether in one person or in many, united together by the band of charity.

The well-tuned cymbals—the loud cymbals. The difference of these instruments seems to be that the former were smaller and clearer-toned, intended to accompany the

voice; the latter louder and deeper, such as are used to clash in military music. Haymo very happily points out that as *cymbals* are always used in pairs, they may fitly denote those who "consider one another, to provoke unto love and to good works," and to the praise of God. They are *well-tuned*, from the holiness of their deeds and words in accordance with the Divine will; *loud* in their clear boldness and in their full rejoicing. The Old and New Testaments, too, in their wondrous agreement and harmony, are *well-tuned cymbals*; as are also the heart and lips of a Saint when in prayer or praise. And when the two great choirs of Angels and men shall join together, blending in concord, and filling heaven and earth with melody, then God shall be praised upon the *loud cymbals*.

In this great concert for the marriage feast of the Lamb, all the modes of producing musical tunes are named, breath for the trumpet and pipe, vibration of strings in psaltery and harp, blows for the beat of drum and clash of cymbals, all which are spiritual types of ourselves; and then, lest ought should be lacking, lest the understanding should fail to accompany the voice, the Psalmist ends his great song with the words: "Let every thing that hath breath: praise the Lord. [Alleluia]." When, at the creation of man, God made him a sentient and rational being, it is written that "He breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and man became a living soul;" and that same *breath* is meant here: so that the words ought to run, *Let every breath* [or with Vulgate *spirit*] *praise the Lord*. It is with a most deep significance that these words form the Antiphon to this Psalm when it is used in the Office of the Dead, as teaching us that when the body is crumbling in the grave, the soul is alive to God, and the whole being of man can say, "I sleep, but my heart waketh," which stands as the noble epigraph over the tombs of the Kings of Spain in the Escorial. And as this vital breath comes directly from God, there is a deep truth in S. Augustine's interpretation, that those who live the true life of the soul, those who are spiritual, are chiefly called on here to praise the Lord, and to praise Him not here alone, where the drum and stringed instruments tell of mortification and suffering, and the cymbals teach the need of mutual aid, but in the full glory of heaven, where flesh, now incorruptible, and spirit are agreed, and the song of one is that of both.

If this quintessence of whole generations of spiritual commentators were all that these volumes contained, it would be enough. They would constitute a treasure priceless and unique. But there is more beside. There is an *apparatus liturgicus* which occupies comparatively a small space, but speaks of an enormous range of labor. Each Psalm has first a few words devoted to the *Title*, when there is one; then the *Argument*, or general drift of the Psalm is given from Thomasius, and one or more others, as Bede, Eusebius, Jerome, etc. For instance, here is this introductory matter as given to the Messianic Psalm xxii.:

TITLE. To the Chief Musician upon Aijeleth Shahar: a Psalm of David.
 In the Vulgate: To the end, for the morning undertaking: a Psalm of David.
 Most mediæval writers: To the end, for the morning hind: a Psalm of David.
 Others: To the Supreme, in the midst of gloom.

In this variety of translations, it is better simply to give the meaning proposed to each. *The morning undertaking* is explained of the capture of our LORD in the morning by the Jews; the commencement of that Passion of which the Psalm treats. To this explanation S. Ambrose and Cassiodorus refer. But the majority of the Fathers understood it of the Resurrection, as having taken place very early in the morning; and to the Resurrection the end of the Psalm certainly alludes. Those who translate, *for the morning hind*, naturally see in this hind the type of our LORD, hunted by his enemies, driven into the snares, and so slain. The mediæval catalogue of the characteristics of the hind naturally led the authors of that time to prefer this meaning. The last translation, if it may be allowed, explains itself. The Chaldee paraphrase, varying from all the others, interprets it, “Concerning the powerful oblation of the perpetual morning :” which, at all events, affords a very beautiful mystical interpretation: the *powerful oblation* being the never-failing intercession of Him Who is indeed the *everlasting Morning* of His people.

ARGUMENT.

ARG. THOMAS. That Christ was pierced with nails, and that over His garments they cast lots. The voice of CHRIST when He was suffering in His Passion.

VEN. BEDE. Through this whole Psalm the LORD CHRIST speaketh. But in its opening, He complaineth that He was forsaken by the FATHER; to the end, namely, that He might undertake His Passion, according to the dispensation of GOD; commending His most powerful humility, brought to pass by the rejection of men, *My God, My God, look upon Me.* Next, He prophesieth His Passion under divers types, beseeching that He may be delivered from His raging enemies: *Many bulls are come about Me.* Thirdly, He exhorteth Christians to praise the LORD, Who, in His Resurrection looked upon the Catholic Church, lest if they heard of His Passion only, the hearts of men should tremble.

EUSEBIUS OF CESAREA. A prophecy of the Passion of CHRIST, and of the vocation of the Gentiles.

S. JEROME. The context of the whole Psalm sets forth CHRIST.

It is worthy of notice, that Theodore of Mopsuestia was condemned in the fifth Ecumenical Council, and in the Provincial Synod of Rome under Vigilius, for asserting that this Psalm was to be understood of David only, and had no direct reference to our LORD: one of the few instances in which the Church has condemned or asserted a particular explanation of a particular text of Scripture. The most ancient explanations of the Jews themselves refer it to CHRIST: and Rabbi Solomon says that the Messiah in the midst of His sufferings would sing this Psalm aloud.

Besides the *Argument* thus fully and variedly given, there follows a couple of sections which to the ordinary reader will convey little or no idea, but to the student of “Hours” and “Breviaries” and “Uses,” they will be simply invaluable. The first of these two sections in the case of Psalm xxii. is as follows:

VARIOUS USES.

Gregorian. Prime: originally on Sunday, now on Friday. [Good Friday: I. Nocturn.

Monastic. Sunday: Matins: I. Nocturn.

Parisian. Friday: Nones. [Good Friday: I. Nocturn.]

Lyons. Friday: Sext. [Good Friday: I. Nocturn.]

Ambrosian. Tuesday of the First Week: II. Nocturn. [Maundy Thursday: Matins. Good Friday: II. Nocturn.]

Quignon. Friday: Matins. I. Nocturn.

Eastern Church. Prime: Good Friday.

Then follows the other section, which gives some few of the great variety of *Antiphons* found in the different Uses, as follows:

ANTIPHONS.

Gregorian. Good Friday: They parted My garments among them, and for My vesture did they cast lots.

Parisian. Good Friday: They gaped upon Me with their mouths, as it were a ramping and a roaring lion: the council of the wicked layeth siege against Me.

Ambrosian. [Maundy Thursday: Deliver My soul from the sword.* My darling from the power of the dog. *Kyrie, Kyrie, Kyrie.* Good Friday: Many oxen are come about Me* fat bulls close Me in on every side. *Kyrie, Kyrie, Kyrie.]*

Mozarabic. My God, My God, look upon Me: why hast Thou forsaken Me?

Now all this liturgical information, in this condensed shape, is thus given in regard to every Psalm of the entire Psalter. And there is an after-piece to each Psalm as rich in its way, though of a very different character. There is, at the end of each Psalm, a group of Collects, gathered out of a vast variety of Liturgies and other devotional works, some being of exquisite beauty, depth and tenderness, and *all* being a rich gain to our Anglican branch of the Church Catholic, which has curtailed its public liturgical offices almost to the smallest conceivable minimum, and should therefore receive thankfully every contribution that may be made from the abundant storehouses of less niggardly branches.

One entire branch of this complex and admirable work still remains to be noticed. There are, in different portions of the four goodly volumes, five *Dissertations* on various subjects connected with the Book of Psalms.

The *first* Dissertation is on "The Psalms as employed in the Offices of the Church," and to the liturgical student is richly worth the whole price of the four volumes. It gives, in detail,

the Roman use, as finally arranged by S. Gregory; the Monastic scheme, as first developed by S. Benedict; the Mozarabic, as the only surviving example of the ancient Gallic rite; the Ambrosian, as deriving its peculiarities from the great father of Psalmody; and these are followed by the various schemes which characterized the different Gallican reforms of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Then is given the arrangement of the Psalter which has been adopted by the Church at Constantinople. Next is unfolded, with singular clearness and power, the whole marvellous system of *Antiphons*, as anciently practised both in the West and the East, with the gradual changes introduced by time and the decay of piety. This alone would furnish abundant subject matter for an entire Review article—to say nothing of the *volumes* which might be bestowed upon it without exhausting it. But in passing, we will throw out simply a hint, which may be of use in introducing Church worship among the Freedmen of the South, the Indians of the frontier, or the heathen in distant lands. The Church, in ancient ages, was made up of a laity of whom the bulk were illiterate, and even if they could have read, books were too costly to permit the idea of each worshipper having his own. The body of the *people* recited or sang in public worship only what they could *learn by heart*, and this, of course, was very little in quantity. It was made an important element, however, by dint of judicious repetition. It would be a tough task to teach an illiterate congregation to respond, verse about, through the special Psalms appointed for Easter Day; and dull work for them to stand silent, hearing those glorious Psalms read (mumbled) or sung by other people. But it would be easy to teach them to sing the *one verse* which would give the key-note for the day, “The Lord said unto me: Thou art My Son, this day have I begotten Thee.” The small choir, composed of those who can read, would then lead off, by singing that one verse (the “*Antiphon*”), which the Congregation would repeat, thus getting their cue; the Choir would then go on singing the first verse of the Psalm, when the Congregation would repeat their *Antiphon*; then the Choir would sing the next verse, followed by the Congregation’s *Antiphon*; and so on to the end of the Psalm. For instance, take the 2nd Psalm:

² *Choir*.—The LORD said unto Me: Thou art My Son, this day have I begotten Thee.

Congregation.—The **LORD** said unto Me: Thou art My **SON**, this day have I begotten Thee.

Choir.—Why do the heathen so furiously rage together: and why do the people imagine a vain thing?

Congregation.—The **LORD** said unto Me: Thou art My **SON**, this day have I begotten Thee.

Choir.—The Kings of the earth stand up, and the rulers take counsel together: against the **LORD** and against His Anointed.

Congregation.—The **LORD** said unto Me: Thou art My **SON**, this day have I begotten Thee.

Choir.—Let us break Their bonds asunder: and cast away Their cords from us.

Congregation.—The **LORD** said unto Me: Thou art My **SON**, this day have I begotten Thee.

Choir.—He that dwelleth in heaven shall laugh them to scorn: the **LORD** shall have them in derision.

Congregation.—The **LORD** said unto Me: Thou art My **SON**, this day have I begotten Thee.

Choir.—Then shall He speak unto them in His wrath: and vex them in His sore displeasure.

Congregation.—The **LORD** said unto Me: Thou art My **SON**, this day have I begotten Thee.

Choir.—Yet have I set My King: upon My holy hill of Sion.

Congregation.—The **LORD** said unto Me: Thou art My **SON**, this day have I begotten Thee.

We are satisfied that some revival of some portion of this ancient Antiphonal system of the Church, is the one practical point which will enable unlettered congregations to be trained to a profitable use of Psalms in public worship. But the marvellous beauty of that ancient system is so great, so varied, so fascinating, and involves such a wealth of spiritual meaning and artistic elaboration, that we must stop here, or we shall be led far beyond our present length and breadth and depth. This Dissertation includes, also, some information about responsories, introits, etc., as well as Canticles. What will our lovers of Canticles in the words of Scripture say to a list of *seventy-seven* Canticles (outside the Psalms) being found in the Mozarabic Breviary, and nearly all from the Old Testament?

The *Second* Dissertation is devoted to the “Primitive and Mediæval Commentators on the Psalms,” with brief notices of each. Besides S. Augustine, Cassiodorus, Bede, Remigius, Bruno, Euthymius Zigabeus, Gerloh, Albertus Magnus, Ludolph, Ayguan, Dionysius the Carthusian, Jacobus Perez de Valentia,

Lorinus, and Balthazar Corderius, which are mainly relied on, we find also S. Hilary, S. Cyril of Alexandria, S. Prosper, S. Gregory the Great, S. Alcuin, Hugh of S. Victor, S. Bernard, S. Thomas Aquinas, John Gerson, and others, who have treated of only a portion of the Psalms.

The *Third* Dissertation is inserted after the 30th Psalm, and occupies less than fifty pages, but is of priceless value. It is on "The mystical and literal interpretation of the Psalms," and is a triumphant vindication of the rightfulness of the spiritual or mystical *principle* of interpretation, and the inherent absurdity of every ground upon which a condemnation of it can be based. In this dissertation Dr. Neale's extraordinary learning, his deep and thorough grasp of Catholic Theology, and his rare power of poetic fancy, are all twisted together in a threefold cord of strength and beauty.

The *Fourth* Dissertation is of less value than any of the others. It is inserted in the 2nd Volume, after Psalm lvi. It attempts to arrange the Psalms in the order of their true chronological sequence: a point in which there is not only much inherent uncertainty, but the power of getting at such truth as may be accessible requires a cultivation of verbal and historical criticism in microscopic detail, which was entirely remote from Dr. Neale's usual habit of mind and study.

Various other Dissertations were promised or contemplated by Dr. Neale, but were never written: one of which is particularly to be regretted, for it was to have treated the whole subject of the divisions, diction, and mystical character of the Psalter, and to have discussed the causes of the frequent discrepancies between the Hebrew, Greek and Vulgate. Dr. Littledale has himself supplied

The *Fifth* Dissertation, which is inserted in Vol. IV., after Psalm cxxxiv., and treats of "The Psalms as used in the Sacraments and Rites of the Church." In the compilation of this, many of the leading Oriental and Western Uses are set before us, with great fulness and clearness.

A few words as to the double authorship of this unique Commentary on the Psalms, and we have done.

It is not often that a brilliant beginning is taken up and com-

pleted with equal spirit and power, even by the author himself. Incomparably more rare is it, to find a very peculiar work begun well by one man, and finished well by another. And there were circumstances connected with the origin of this Commentary making it exceptionally peculiar in several ways. Dr. Neale tells us that from the time when, at College, he was called to attend on the Daily Service, he began to apply himself to a more special study of the Psalms. His first attempt, in a literary way, was a translation of S. Bernard's Commentary on the 90th (91st) Psalm, which, to his no small pride, he says, was thought worthy of a place in one of the ecclesiastical magazines of the day. In the December of 1843, he was admitted by the kindness of the Canons of Funchal, in the Madeiras, to the use of the Cathedral library there, which contained the best mediæval writers, as well as nearly all the Fathers; and he there began to carry out what had been for some time definitely in his mind—the preparation of a Commentary on the Psalms. He finished seven Psalms in the course of the winter, which, on his return to England, were published in the *Churchman's Companion*. Their reception was so warm as to encourage him to begin the more diligent study of the regular commentators on the Psalms, as well as to open a commonplace book to store all waifs and estrays that might come within his reach from other sources. Subsequently, his connection with the Sisterhood of S. Margaret's, at East Grinstead, involving the weekly recitation of the *Psalter*, roused him to persevere in the task he had set himself, with a more real and earnest interest; and the publication of the first volume of this Commentary, with three of the Dissertations, was at length the result. This work, then, took root in the earliest unfolding of his manhood, was penetrated with picturesque and tender associations of the tropics, was watered by the weekly recitation of the *Psalter*, was enriched by the continuous wakefulness and watchfulness of the mind through more than twenty years, was saturated through and through with the poetic glow, the devotional tenderness, and the graceful fervor, of a mind like Dr. Neale's. The very peculiar range of his reading through shelves of tomes forgotten by the moderns, and the industry of this honey-bee in extracting sweetness from every flower he touched, especially the culling of so

many fragrant fragments from the older Hymn-writers of Christendom : all these, one would think, would ensure it that an incomplete work begun by such a mind, never could be adequately finished by any other.

Very different were the circumstances under which Dr. Littledale took up the work for completion. At the close of the comment on the fifth verse of the 59th Psalm, there is a reference to this simple foot-note : "At this point the Commentary of John Mason Neale ceases. The pen, fallen from the hand of the great scholar, poet and divine, is henceforth taken up by the weak fingers of his disciple, R. F. L." At the time of Dr. Neale's departure, Dr. Littledale's hands were full of other work ; and before he could undertake the new task, it was essential to accumulate the necessary books, as only a few of them were then in his possession, and Dr. Neale's library was no longer accessible to him. It was thus late in the autumn of 1867 before he was ready to begin his part of the work. The graceful modesty with which Dr. Littledale excuses the "inferiority" of his continuation, is very beautifully expressed :

Continuations are proverbially unsuccessful, even when the artist himself makes the effort, and even when that artist is a Cervantes, a Bunyan, or a De Foe. Much more is failure to be expected when a feeble copyist takes up the pencil of a great master. It is true that as this Commentary is chiefly a mosaic from old writers, the peril seems at first sight less. But it is not really so. Two jewellers may have identical piles of gold and gems given them as materials, and the one will produce with them a wonder of art, while the other obscures their beauty by coarse and tasteless workmanship. Here, moreover, the heaps are not equal. The vast stores of Dr. Neale's learning were hardly less remarkable than the readiness and certainty with which he could draw on them, the ease with which he could illustrate any subject he treated, with apt classical allusion, parallels lying hid in history or legend, hymn or song, of ancient or modern times. Any one coming after him in the many paths of his labors is at a disadvantage in comparison, but especially in a field so peculiarly his own as the mystical interpretation of Scripture.

He trusts that, as he attempted the task only in fulfilment of the wishes of the departed, he may commit it "to the lenient consideration of those who will not expect a mere student to equal in a few months' labor that which cost a great teacher more than as many years."

Moreover, Dr. Littledale could not let the accumulation of material run on as a sort of accompaniment, for years, to other

labors—a sort of precipitate settling of its own accord at the bottom of an ocean of other activities—but was compelled to accomplish what he could in fierce spurts of concentrated and intense toil, between long and grievous attacks of illness, that have almost prevented locomotion, and at times render intellectual work an impossibility. It is under these drawbacks that he has gone on so successfully, that one would need *his* familiarity with the subject to detect any inferiority in any respect. He has added, moreover, more than a dozen to the long list of writers used by Dr. Neale; he has, in the latest edition, added a translation into English verse of many of the poetic excerpts given by Dr. Neale in their original language; he has added very considerably, in places, to the work as Dr. Neale left it, bringing it up to a more uniform fulness; and what is of still greater value, he has added not a little of the best of the results of modern critical research, and a spice of Hebraistic learning, oftentimes of singular force in illustrating the true meaning of the text. We will give only one example of this. In Psalm xlv. 10, on the phrase, “Upon Thy right hand did stand the queen in a vesture of gold, wrought about with divers colours,” which is interpreted of the Church, Dr. Littledale forcibly adds: “It is to be noted that the Hebrew word for *Queen* means a queen *consort*, not a queen *regnant*, thereby teaching us that her royal dignity is derived from CHRIST, and not inherent of her own right or merit.” And in the former part of the same verse we find another of the same sort: “In ‘Kings’ daughters were among thy *honourable women*,” says Dr. Littledale, “we lose the beauty of the original: ‘Kings’ daughters were among *Thy Jewels*:” and he : ptly compares the promise: “They shall be Mine, saith the LORD of Hosts, in that day when I make up My jewels.”

But we have said enough, we trust, to satisfy our readers that for devotional or homiletic purposes—for *every* purpose, indeed, except that of mere textual and archaic criticism—this *Commentary on the Psalms* is by far the most valuable that is now within easy reach in the English language, nor is it likely to be superseded for many generations. Let us close with the closing words of Dr. Littledale himself, at the end of the 150th Psalm. He has commented on the “Alleluia” with which that Psalm concludes, and then adds:

So, with the melody of heaven echoing around me, I, by the waters of Babylon, hang up this harp of the LORD, after striving to sing His song in a strange land, saying to Him as I do so: "And now, O LORD God, if in this work I have said any thing which is Thine, Thine own will recognize it; and if I have said any thing which is mine, do Thou and Thine forgive it." What I have said of Thine, receive; what I have ignorantly uttered of mine own, pardon; and bring us to that vision where we can no longer err, O LORD JESU CHRIST, to that happy life of praise and blessing where the unending Song is uplifted.

Now from all men be outpoured
Alleluia to the LORD;
With Alleluia evermore
The SON and SPIRIT we adore.

Praise be done to the Three in One.
Alleluia! Alleluia! Alleluia!

JOHN HENRY HOPKINS.

THE QUESTION OF IMMORTALITY.

If it be true in a general sense that the race is a unit in its life and progress; that every age is the inheritor of the whole past, and starts enriched by the acquisition and matured by the discipline of all time; it is also true that every age has its individual life to live, its individual training and experience to undergo. It has its own theories to form and put in practice; it has its own views, its own moral temperament and mental cast. Hence the abiding mystery that enshrouds the human condition—encompassing existence as an island is encompassed by the waters of an unknown ocean—presents varying aspects to mankind in different ages of their mental history. Each age confronts it from the stand-point of its own idiosyncrasy; is struck by the aspect that appeals most directly to its own feeling; seeks the solution that will satisfy the demands of its own mind, and cannot be entirely content with the solutions of former ages, because no former age has seen the problems precisely as it sees them, none has put precisely the same questions which it is led to put, or at least has not put them in precisely the same form.

The present is a deeply inquiring age; an age remarkable for high and widely diffused culture, and so peculiar in kind and degree are its intellectual demands that the results of former research and the formulas of past conclusions seem to it peculiarly inadequate to those demands. At many points we have broken with the past, and we are thrown into a temporary confusion. Beliefs are shaken; convictions unsettled; there is a clamor of contrary cries; we feel ourselves adrift on the flux and reflux of uncertainty.

Thus it is, to come to our present point, that the question of Immortality, in spite of Plato and the New Testament, is to-day a vexed question with many, and the old doctrine of future life widely doubted, disputed and denied. As we all know, the doubt

and disbelief on the subject is largely owing to those materialistic tendencies and habits of thought which have grown up under the influence of the modern study of nature. There is no need to enlarge on this point. It is a thrice-told tale. In these days scarcely anything is said in the intellectual world which does not bear some reference to that triumphant advance of physical science which has marked this century, like the fifteenth, as a great era of awakening for the human mind. We have entered deep within the *arcana* of the natural world, discovered its methods and surprised its secrets. Patient study of facts prepares the way for large inductions, mechanical action is traced to its dynamic sources, and the minds of men swell at the wider vision of the universe that greets them from the heights they have attained. Now this intense activity and immense achievement may be viewed with pure admiration or with pure dislike and dread, but to the impartial observer two things are evident; that it brings some present evil, and that it brings prospective good.

The evil comes from the one-sidedness. The scientist will know nature, and nature only, and thence the step is short to holding that there is nothing else to know. He believes in what he calls the "scientific method," and he believes in no other, contemning every other mental process as fanciful theorizing, and the subjects they are concerned with, as coinage of the brain. He appropriates the general term, science, to the results of his own labor, and this exclusive claim has long since gone by default. Christian believers acquiesce in it, and are content to admit with the poet:

We have but faith, we cannot know,
For knowledge is of things we see.

Thus the notion strikes deep and spreads wide that the sensuous and the material are synonyms for the real and the true. Men's consciousness of their own spiritual nature grows dim within them and their ancient faith in spiritual realities is slipping from their grasp. Religious interest them as creations of the "mythic consciousness," records of their mental childhood, but religious doctrines are as devoid of practical interest as speculations on lunar polities would be, for the modern nature-worship knows no gods but blind matter and brute force. Looking upon themselves as merely finer animals, these men are content to trace their pedigree

to the ape and seek no other ancestor ; and, stranger still, they are content to say, "That befalleth the sons of men which befalleth beasts ; as the one dieth, so dieth the other." Physiology is their passion ; thought and feeling are molecular changes of the nervous centres ; the basis of life is solely physical, and the belief in it apart from that, a dream. Knowing only and caring only for the human carcass, they see a matter-mote rise up by an easy process of evolution into a monkey, and thence into a man,—as man live its little day, then die, disintegrate, dissolve into the matter-mote again. They look forward to their own extinction with calmness, and even in some cases with something of enlightened pride. They see themselves "blown about the desert dust or sealed within the iron hills," and the prospect does *not* chill or sicken their hearts.

In view of this strange aberration of the scientific mind, in which the understanding tramples out the instinctive sentiments of the soul, it may well be asked where we find the prospect of any good to come from modern science ? We answer, in the settled conviction that all deep intellectual movement is ultimately intellectual advance. All roads lead to Truth. The progress may be on lines that seem to return upon themselves, but it is progress still. For all its retrogressive windings the river bears on surely to the sea. This popular materialism cannot last. It is a back-water in the great river of progress, and it is even now on the ebb. We can discern a break between the unthinking masses and their thoughtful leaders. While the one, exulting in their new-found "freedom" of thought, are eager to throw off their old convictions and with them their hope of immortality, the others proceed more cautiously. They will not decide the point ; they go no further than to call immortality an open question, one not proved nor disproved. For their earlier principles are changing color under their eyes. The new materialism even drops its old name. Prof. Huxley tells us : "I am no materialist ; I believe that system to involve grave philosophical error." Mr. Spencer tells us that the facts of existence may be described indifferently in terms of materialism or in terms of idealism, but that, for his part, he prefers the latter. Physical science in fact has advanced from perception to thought. It is no longer satisfied with salts and stones according to their appear-

ance; it inquires what they *are*. It has left phenomena for their forces and laws; that is, for something immaterial and hyper-physical. Its search for the principles of matter finds them to be principles of mind; the farther it advances the more purely intellectual becomes the matter of its quest, until it comes itself to the admission that "there is no sensuous objectivity of which intellectual elements do not constitute the essence." If then, as we believe, the ultimate reality is spirit, and science is the honest seeking for truth, what difference does it make that she begins with matter? The result must be the same, and perhaps the surer for being slowly reached.

We can see already how this advance of natural science brings the question of immortality face to face with large analogies. Our new learning teaches the indestructibility of matter and the persistence of force. No smallest atom perishes or is wholly lost. There is metamorphosis, there is no cessation. Decomposition is in order to recombination, and everywhere disappearance leaves behind it the promise to reappear. My body will perish in its existing form and turn to dust. But that dust itself is imperishable, immortal; it will take on new forms, and enter into new combinations to the end of time. And so force amid its infinite transmutations is self-existent and eternal. The ray of light that falls on the scattered seed, blooms in the way side flower, and after ages of long burial, is dug up in the coal-bed, and on the hearth-stone emits once more its latent, undying spark. Men have not failed to see how these analogies from the inorganic world point to the conservation and continuity of life, and there are many who exclaim to-day: We too believe in immortality—not indeed as you conceive it, a petty individualism, but the immortality of man, the perpetuation of the human race. Men die, but Man lives on—one great Being ever growing toward perfection through the service of all who have lived for its sake. In this lies our individual immortality; we contribute something to the stock of human thought or human effort, and we live forever in the life of humanity, in our share in the progress of the race, in the memory and gratitude of men to come. Such a creed may sound cold and comfortless to the Christian, yet it is worth his consideration. To devote ourselves to the service of a generalization, and to look for

after life only in our work interwoven with the progress of mankind, will scarcely satisfy the cravings and aspirations of the personal soul. Such impersonal immortality seems indeed but a fine name for annihilation. Yet the two main ideas of Positivism—that the race, as a whole, is advancing to perfection, and that the individual has higher duties to mankind than to himself—these must claim a Christian's sympathy. Consider this immortality of sacrifice, in which the social feeling is so victorious over self-love that one is content to merge his individuality in the unity of the common nature, and drop his separate being for the wider life of the undying race, and we must admit it to be a lofty and generous conception. Compare it with the narrow feeling too common among us, which makes men cling to immortality from desire of selfish happiness; which makes them dwell on their own future as their only interest; which shuts out social feeling and shuts them in to individualism; which narrows all their care to securing their own eternity, and makes them content to look on the life beyond as bringing to the few continuous union with good, and to the many continuous union with the evil, and we must admit that, some of us might well take a lesson from our enemies, if not as to the substance, yet as to the spirit of their faith.

We should learn then that we have not to argue with a crude and coarse materialism. The leaders of science have got past that and will bring those among whom it lingers, up to their own level. They admit the persistence of life in general, but deny the permanence of any particular form it assumes. The whole question of immortality as between Christianity and Science centres to-day in a single point: the continuity of individual consciousness—the permanence of the personal being which we are.

There are two general arguments to establish this point. One is the popular argument of appeal to the intuitions of consciousness. It is in common use with preachers and poets, for it is of a sort that comes home naturally to the minds of all men. We have an instinctive belief that we are made to live forever. We have looked on death; we know its outward signs, but we cannot believe that the whole truth of the matter is told us by our senses. We feel within us,

Those obstinate questionings,
Of sense and outward things,
Which, be they what they may,
Are yet the fountain light of all our day.

They may be stilled for a season, but cannot be silenced forever, and in their presence the idea of annihilation is as abhorrent to our natural reason, as to our natural feelings. Our feet are set within a world of finitude. A darkness that rises from the valley of shadow falls everywhere around us, and to our ears comes ever the sublime lament of things that die. And yet we walk this earth with the conscious bearing of a race of immortals. This short flutter of joys and pains, this brief glimmer of smiles and tears—this is not all our life. We feel,

That life shall live forevermore,
Else earth is darkness at the core,
And dust and ashes all that is.

If for a moment the thought crosses our brain that this human soul, "the roof and crown of things," could die and make no sign, the solid earth fails beneath our feet, and something seems to break within our heart. Now

Who forged this other influence,
This heat of inward evidence,
By which we doubt against the sense?

How shall we account for this voice within our soul, if it be not here to reveal a fact? What shall we believe or trust if not these innate convictions of our common consciousness?

The second argument we speak of is the philosophic argument from the nature of the soul. It shows that spirit, self-conscious being, is substance, and is the only substance. By substance is meant that which is permanent, indestructible and immutable, because it is not subject to any limitation or conditioning from without, but has its whole being within itself. Here is the difference between personality and individuality. The being of every individual thing is dependent upon the totality of the conditions surrounding it. Change them and you destroy it. A piece of iron rusts or oxidizes until it is a piece of iron no longer. A stone may

be pulverized, dissolved in water, chemically changed until its elements are united with those of other things, and its original identity is lost. But the being of a person is independent, it is self-existence. If the person *alters*, it must be through its own act. Alteration is Latin for "othering." In the case of the individual thing, alteration is effected by the influence of some *other* thing. Water alters in obedience to temperature; as water it ceases to be, becoming ice or vapor. But the person is self-determining; he is his own "other," his own limit, his own means and his own end. Thus personal being is beyond the reach of external event, is without the sphere of finitude. The existence of spirit is of necessity its existence forever. The existence of self-conscious beings is of necessity the existence of immortal beings. When therefore the naturalist tells the philosopher: On the whole we have given up the theory of immortality, the latter can only answer with a compassionate smile. It strikes him as it would strike the naturalist to be told, "on the whole we have given up the theory of gravitation." Indeed the phrase "immortality of the soul" seems to him an unintelligent expression; it is a pleonastic truism, and to argue it is as if one should argue the non-solidity of liquids, or the non-three-footedness of quadrupeds.

We have referred only briefly to these arguments, because, weighty as they are, they are not nowadays available. The argument from intuition is useless with those who are trained to distrust all intuitive and weigh everything by the critical understanding. The philosophic argument is equally useless with those who are ignorant of philosophy and prejudiced against its study. How then shall Christians to-day go about to establish their doctrine of personal immortality? There remains a method which may seem indirect and inconclusive, but which, it may be hoped, will be effective, for it puts the question on its true ground. And that is this: to rest the doctrine of immortality on the cardinal, elementary doctrines of Christianity—the nature of God, the nature of man and the relation between them; to cease to view it as an independent and isolated question, and to present it as an integral element of Christian truth; to cease to urge and argue it on its own merits as if it stood alone, and to hold and treat it as a corollary, a necessary consequence of Christian principles; so that

we are released from any necessity to prove it, if those principles are proved or admitted. When we have convinced men of the truth of the Christian revelation as it relates to the essential facts of the human condition, we shall find that immortality, and prayer, and providence, and such questions will take care of themselves ; we shall have no further need to argue them. We are too apt to waste our strength in a desultory warfare over regions remote from the main strategie points we hold ; and then those distant regions, covered by our extended lines, are converted into keys of our position. It would be wiser policy to maintain our entrenched camp and offer battle only there, for there victory will be decisive and give us easy mastery of all outlying territory in dispute. This, however, will oblige us to see to it that our entrenchments are kept in good order, proof against the newest inventions in artillery, and up to the highest level of military art, lest we perish under the fall of antiquated and neglected defences. To drop the figure, if we rest the question of immortality on the cardinal truths of Christianity, we must take care fully to apprehend those truths and to present them justly, so that their breadth and depth and living power, their comprehensiveness and their simplicity may be made known to men. And here that we touch, as we conceive, the main root of the difficulty, we shall venture to speak with freedom.

There is reason to fear that it is the simplest and most fundamental of Christian truths that would sound newest in men's ears to-day. We preach too often in place of Christ's Gospel a human theology which is neither reasonable nor Christian. Some of it is the product of the monkish, scholastic mind of a world that has passed away ; some of it was shaped amid the violent excitements and reactionary strifes of the Reformation. It has lost influence over the world's mind. More than that, it has provoked a reaction. It is not too much to say that the current theological teaching is as largely responsible for modern disbelief as is the materialism taught by Science. If men to-day doubt of God and their future life it is because they can no longer believe many dogmas of an orthodox theology which is the only exponent of Christianity they know. Let us not be misunderstood. We do not write to attack theology or decry dogma ; on the contrary we would defend them. But it is to be remembered that theology is not the faith. That

faith indeed was once for all delivered ; it is unchanging and unchangeable. Theology is the measure of man's apprehension of divine truth. Its systems register the conceptions of their time. They give us the best thought and clearest vision their makers could attain to ; they can do no more. Hence theology must change, must move with the movement of the human mind, and its history from Clement and Origen to Bull and Butler is only the record of its growth. It is our part to carry on its progress, and for this we must recognize its deficiencies. No science is injured by correction ; if we clear it of errors, we strengthen it and do it service. Now for many years our theology has been holding up to men ideas of God and of man wholly inadequate to their enlarged and refined conceptions, and they reject them to-day as ignoble and untrue. These ideas were adequate to the past, for they were the product of the past, but they have fallen below the intellectual and moral level of the present, and theology must rise to that level before God and immortality can be a universal faith again.

We shall be told perhaps that the doctrines of the received theology are the teaching of Scripture ; that we cannot have the Christianity of the Bible without them. This is of course the very question we raise. Wherever we hold theology to be erroneous, there we hold it to be unscriptural, and our point is that there are doctrines of this theology not taught by Scripture nor properly derived from it. At once we shall be met by an overwhelming array of proof-texts. But it needs no long study of the Bible to know that such a method can make it prove anything. The devil can cite Scripture for his purpose. These doctrines come from the misreading of Scripture. They spring from that blind literalism that kills, because it misses the *spirit* of truth ; from that false and shallow theory of inspiration which has made an idol of the written word as before the Roman made an idol of the Church ; which shelters itself behind men's misplaced reverence to numb and cramp the faith of Christendom. They are handed down from days when sound scholarship was unknown ; when men's only aim was to find support for theories and their only study how to warp and bend the Bible language to make it fit with the hybrid philosophy of the Schools. They are not in Scripture ; they contradict

its spirit. They are "Aberglaube," the human overgrowth which has buried and choked the simple truths of the Gospel.

Let us turn to one or two of these theologic doctrines which bear on the question of immortality and see if they are not as much at variance with the spirit of Christianity as with the dictates of an educated reason. There is a theological idea of God which cuts Him off from any close or constant relation to the universe or to mankind. According to this, six thousand years ago God made the heavens and the earth, and now He rests from all His work that He has done. The finished spheres rolled from His hands complete as the ship that glides from the dockyard when the builder launches it and leaves it. The universe is wound up like a clock to run by its natural laws, and there is no action left to the Creator but one of interference. When He appears in His own person, it can only be to interrupt the continuity of the natural order. There is a regular, settled course of things, but a special Providence occasionally interposes to make them go differently. And so the feeling grows up that somehow the material world is not God's own, and miracles are valued for proving the important truth that God can suspend the laws of nature at His will. It is no wonder that scientific men feel they can dispense with such a do-nothing God who sits apart from the world, a remote and misty phantom, supposed to possess a sort of disused veto-power. It is no wonder that in the necessity they find for some actual source of life and energy, they personify an abstraction and call it Nature.

This narrow and mechanical notion of the Creator is not Christian. He whom we know through Christ is about us and before us as well as behind us. God is in everything or He is in nothing. He is no "Supreme Being" of French Deism. He is to be conceived as *in* the universe, not as *out* of it. As we learn to know "Nature," we learn to know the methods of His working Who is its indwelling life and ever-active power. St. Paul knows nothing of our distinction between natural and supernatural, as if both were not equally divine; although conservative theologians might well shrink from the seeming "Pantheism" of his language: "One God and Father of all, who is above all and through all and in you all." "Of Him and through Him and to Him are all things." Again, if the sole, all-working energy of the nat-

ural world is a personal will, there is nothing lawless in a miracle. It is only the immediate exertion of the same power that ordinarily works mediately. Thus miracles are not evidence to God, but God is the evidence to miracles. We believe in the wondrous works of Christ because we believe in Christ. And this is the mental attitude He approved. That men should believe in Him because they saw signs and wonders He expressly discouraged. Of one village the evangelist tells that "He did there no mighty work, because of their unbelief."

Now this God of nature is revealed to us as the Father of mankind. In that single word what a world of meaning centres! It fills and satisfies the mind and the soul. But the false theology has severed this relation as it has the other. The God of such theology is in His own being self-sufficient. He creates the world for His own glory and man to pay Him worship.¹ He has no duties toward us. He has the rights of a feudal lord over his serfs. We have no business to judge of the right or wrong of His actions; the sovereign is above the law. And then man, having the misfortune to inherit a diseased moral nature, is strangely enough held accountable for that misfortune. He is by nature born in sin and a child of wrath. He is under a curse. With evil propensities and little strength to resist them, he is thrown into a world of temptation and left to take his very slight chance of escaping eternal damnation at the hands of a just God who hateth iniquity. It is no wonder that men of clear head revolt against such a caricature of Christ's Gospel, and prefer no religion to a bad one. Where in this is the great truth of the Divine fatherhood? Where God's patient, tender, self-forgetting love, so beautifully taught us in the parables of Christ? Where St. Paul's grand idea that He must always and through everything remain true to His own

¹It is told of a well known clergyman of the Episcopal Church, still living, that having to conduct an examination for priest's orders, he asked the question, "What is the Divine object and motive in creation?" The candidate promptly responded, "The exhibition of the Divine glory," and was somewhat startled at the abrupt demand in a formidable voice, "How would you like that to be said of you?" "I don't understand, Sir," he faltered. "Why, suppose you had done some worthy or generous action, how would you like it to be said that you had only done it for the sake of showing yourself off?"

nature? "If we believe not, yet He abideth faithful; He cannot deny Himself." It seems that this theology has done for us what St. Paul believed impossible when he exclaimed: "I am persuaded that neither death nor life, nor things present nor things to come, nor height nor depth nor any other creature shall be able to separate us from the love of God which is in Christ Jesus."

Nor is the matter greatly helped by the doctrine of the atonement, as commonly taught. The Gospel account, that God so loved the world that He sent His Son to save sinners—and to save them not only from punishment but from *sin*—this was soon overclouded and perverted by the barbarism it sought to convert. It could not cope with the notions of wild justice it came in contact with. When the barbarian was wronged, his resentment demanded the suffering of the offender; and adequate suffering could expiate the injury. Such is the barbaric notion of justice; "an eye for an eye, a tooth for a tooth." But if suffering is what justice demands, and what satisfies it, it is but a step to hold that the suffering of one may be undergone by another,—that it makes no difference to justice whether the offender suffers or some one else in his place. The records of uncivilized people are full of examples of this vicarious punishment. For instance, the story of Zaleukos who when his son was condemned to lose both his eyes, gave one of his own to reduce the penalty. Now the god of the barbarian was but himself "writ large." These savage notions soon began to work upon men's view of the Christian faith, and in course of time passed into the growing theology. God's justice, outraged by men's sins, demanded a satisfaction in the form of suffering, and His infinite majesty could be satisfied only by their eternal pains. But Christ had suffered on the cross in their place, and His few hours' agony, curiously multiplied by the dignity of His divinity, was accepted as equivalent to their endless torments. These views were thrown into legal forms of expression under the influence of the Roman law upon some doctors of the Church, and hence they are still called the "forensic" view of the Atonement. As Llewelyn Davies has pointed out, no civilized court of law would admit for a moment the principles assumed. That the proper demand of justice is a fixed equivalent of suffering; that this should be proportioned to the dignity of the person injured—

as when a serf was whipped for killing his fellow serf, but hung for striking a knight; that it is indifferent whether the offender suffer or some one else for him—these are assumptions which modern criminal law would simply find matter of amusement. Some who feel it difficult to defend theological tradition on this point resort to a desperate device. They tell us that divine justice is not the same as human, and that we cannot argue from one to the other. This is utterly to confuse the moral sense, and to undermine the foundations of ethical thought and practice. It is because our moral convictions—and among them our idea of justice—are *absolute* to our reason that they are authoritative with us. We must rather trust their voice as to their divine character than this unsupported assertion to the contrary. Besides, as the writer just referred to remarks, “it would be singular indeed that the justice of God should differ from that of civilized men only by resembling that of primitive barbarism.” We cannot wonder then that men of to day turn from the Gospel of reconciliation with contemptuous indifference when it is thus misrepresented.

Another point of this theologic teaching more than all the rest has shaken men’s faith in their immortality, and that is the doctrine of the future life itself. Its retributive penalties and its recompensing joys have been so represented that men cannot bring themselves to believe in the one or to care for the other. The picture of unending bliss is weak and colorless to the point of the absurd. Our spiritual existence is described in earthly images of baldest materialism. There is a city of gorgeous splendor with thrones of sapphire, walls of jasper and gates of pearl. The action for the scene is as monotonous as human faculties are varied,—if action it can be called, for to stand forever robed in shining white, chanting hymns of adoration, seems little else than idleness. If the heaven of the old theology ever did kindle the imagination, it does so now no longer. The docile believer contemplates this eternity of dullness with a secret sinking of the heart, and we cannot wonder if the less reverent turn from it with good-natured contempt. If the picture of heaven is weak, the picture of hell is horrible. The torments of the wicked have these singular characteristics: they are physical; they are penal, not reformatory; and they are uniform or undiscriminating. Can any healthy reason

which has learned its Christianity from the four gospels bring itself to believe in a hell where the punishments of condemned spirits are purely corporeal, of a sort suited only to the body as it is laid down at death; where they are utterly aimless and retrospective, undesigned by the Judge who is also the Saviour of men to work the sinner's purification; where they are indiscriminate upon all, visiting all alike with the same tortures, regardless of the infinite variations in degree of sin which earthly lives present; where above all they are eternal, not because the sins of time can merit the retribution of eternity, but on the feudal principal referred to that punishment should be proportioned not to the offender's guilt, but to the dignity of the person offended,—and this although the doctrine carries with it the monstrous Manichean fancy of an eternity of evil in God's world which He cannot or will not prevent? Shall we wonder that men reject this ghastly doctrine which makes their heavenly Father the arbitrary and relentless Moloch of the universe?

Here then, in view of these errors of the past, we learn our first duty as teachers of immortality. It is because the infidels identify this theological caricature with the religion of Christ that they reject the one with the other. If we disavow it, we disarm them. It is dangerous to cast pearls before swine, but it is also dangerous to give starving men stones for bread. Let us learn that such a false teaching is our worst hindrance to success. Let us free ourselves from the traditional errors and misconceptions that clog our speech and distort our message, and the Gospel of Christ, now as at the beginning, will conquer the world.

And with that Gospel is bound up the faith in immortality. For those who accept the Christian teachings as to God and man, and cherish them not merely as a doctrinal system for the head, but as a living reality for the heart and life—disbelief in immortality becomes impossible. Our surest way to teach that truth is to educate the religious spirit, and lead into the religious life. They who live in conscious communion with a heavenly Father, know that if in this world only they have hope in Him, they are of all men most miserable; and in that consciousness they feel that when men talk of the annihilation of a human soul, they are

talking nonsense. And this faith is founded on a fact. We are one with God in our essential nature, for spiritual being is one and homogeneous. We spirits are made in God's image, and He has been made in ours. "He that sanctifieth and they who are sanctified are all of one." "For as He is, so are we in this world." And not only is there unity of nature, there is communion of life. "In Him we live and move and have our being." Our being is contained in and sustained by His. We abide in Him and He in us, and He abides forever. We share in His life, and as that life is everlasting, we know that we too are immortal. Thus His existence certifies our unending life, for "He is not a God of the dead, but of the living." Death is therefore only an event in life; it is death of the body, but it is new birth of the spirit. That which our soul cries out for at sight of death is a reality; the bodily husk falls from us only to waken us to a fuller consciousness and a truer reality. It was the fancy of the ancients to speak of the "sleep of death," but for the Christian, life is the sleep from which death wakens him.

Our birth is but a sleep and a forgetting.

In death the spirit opens its eyes, recalled from a troubled dream to the realities of its life, which have all the time surrounded it unseen, and to the Father who has been all the time "not far from every one of us." In this faith our life is "builded far from accident." We are persuaded that nothing can separate us from the living God; not life nor death, nor things present nor things to come, nor angels nor principalities nor powers. The spirit which we are, is anchored safe in the Spirit whose we are, for He is all in all.

If now we look back from the plane of this reasonable faith to the view of the Positivist, in which we have admitted there is something to admire, we shall find that we have no need to borrow from it, if we but hold the truths of our religion in the grasp of an adequate conception. We can answer: Our religion also teaches the eternal progress of the race; we too believe in the conservation of all human effort to the general good, but we believe besides in the unending life of the individual workers and their unceasing work. You look to a sacrificial death for the undying race; we look to an endless life of loving service. We too have our immor-

tality in the grateful affection of our fellow men, but it is an affection we shall be alive to feel and answer to. You speak of an immortal humanity all whose past generations are dead—whose life is only in the future; we believe that all men who have been, are—a mighty host whom we on earth call dead because they are removed to a better world whither we too are going. You believe in the concentration of the whole race into an ideal Man whose continuous life preserves the memory of our thoughts and deeds; we too believe in that ideal Man, but not as an abstraction, powerless to hold any vital relation to our souls, not as a metaphysic shadow, but as a person, the God-Man, Christ in whom we are re-created, whose name is Eternal Love. Your conception has a kind of barren grandeur, but it does not rise to the magnificence of ours; it is a lower thought, and we will not change gold for lead.

Thus all of truth and nobleness there is in Positivism, and more than that, we have in Christianity, for it was the misconception of a dull and narrow-hearted past to view our future life as an inert repose of selfish bliss. The spiritual world is one of beauty and of rest, but not such beauty as speaks only to the outward eye, not such rest as the wearied body longs for, not such a world as it appeared to Oriental or to Mediæval fancy. A peace that passeth understanding welcomes the weary and heavy-laden from their struggle with the cares of life, from their deeper struggle with the weakness of the flesh; but it is a peace of freer action, not of idleness. In the many mansions of our Father's house shall be found full room for the development of all our nobler faculties—reason, imagination, the affections, the active energies. Feelings which have found no food here shall there be satisfied. Faint possibilities of our nature which here we see in glimpses shall there be grasped and made realities. New aspirations shall call to higher action. The outlines of life shall be filled up and the rough sketch finished as we grow into a perfect man, the stature of the fulness of Christ. A world of boundless knowledge and unbounded capacities to learn, of glorious work to do and adequate faculties to do it—this shall be our home.

" For doubtless unto each is given,
A life that bears immortal fruit;
In such great offices as suit,
The full-grown energies of heaven."

The scholar and the seeker will be there, and the check of earthly limitation shall be taken away and the secrets of all time and space given them to study. The prophets and reformers will be there, and shall be sent forth now on larger missions with ampler powers. The heroes of the right will be there, and shall be called now to conquests crowned with no blood-stained laurels. And the loving and the tender will be there—they who have made their lives a ministry to troubled souls and broken hearts, and that ministry shall be carried on in wider ways we know not of.

For it is a home of purified and permanent affections, where misconception melts into insight, divisions into sympathy and hatred into love. A household and a family where the dearest dreams of home-life shall find their happy fulfilment; where all interchange of thought and feeling shall be freer, fuller and more perfect; where those we have loved shall ever be around us, with others whom we shall know in person as we have known them by name—all the innumerable company of the great and good of every age and clime. And where the purified in heart shall see God; where we shall live in the light of our Father's countenance, and meet face to face our elder brother, Christ.

F. A. HENRY.

THE VOYAGE OF VERRAZANO.¹

In the year 1477, while engaged in a voyage to the North, Christopher Columbus sailed three hundred miles beyond Iceland, and, by accident it would appear, escaped the re-discovery of those coasts so well known in the tenth and eleventh centuries, a map of which was published in Germany during the year 1482.² Again, in 1492, when sailing westward across the Atlantic towards Florida, with the chart of the Italian Toscanelli in his hand, he was persuaded by Martin Alonzo Pinzon to change his course towards the south-west. This resulted in the discovery of the West Indies, which to the day of his death he fondly believed to be the outlying Isles of Cathay. Addressing Columbus, Pinzon said: "It seems to me like an inspiration that my heart dictates to me that we ought to steer in a different direction." And the fact that Pinzon's "inspiration" was cunningly drawn from the movements of a flock of parrots which he had seen flying towards the south-west, and as he inferred toward the land, does not change the main fact; for whether it was the man's heart or the birds, Columbus was turned aside by Pinzon from his original purpose, and thus left the North American Continent to be discovered by others. The results that hung upon his decision in both of these voyages were incalculable. Had Columbus discovered this continent, the territory of the United States would probably have been known to-day as New Spain, and the gifts of Spanish civilization and religion so lavishly poured upon the

¹ THE VOYAGE OF VERRAZANO: A chapter in the Early History of Maritime Discovery in America. By Henry C. Murphy. ALBANY: JOEL MUNSELL.

² See the Edition of Ptolemy for that year. Also the article by the present writer on "Columbus and the Geographers of the North" (to which this is, in a sense, supplementary) in the *Church Review*, 1870.

countries of Montezuma and the Incas, would have been established in the place of free and enlightened institutions. Under Spanish domination, one might readily imagine the probable character of the Centennial. It might, perhaps, be summed up in the single word, "Mexico."

The stream of French immigration was, on the other hand, deflected towards the north ; though, following the ordinary course of reasoning, the student of history would have inferred, at the outset, that the country now included within the territory of the United States, after the failure of Spain, was destined to become what monarchs and geographers conspired to make it, namely, "New France." And a "New France" would have been hailed by the world far differently from a "New Spain;" yet argument is not required to prove that the world was in no need of either. Such historic reproductions certainly do not appear to have been included in the Providential plan. France, however, was deprived of the fair domain that we enjoy, by an agency that did not operate against Spain, at least in the same way. We refer to the Bull of Alexander VI., which gave the new world to the Spaniards. For, whatever may be the approximate causes, the remote reason for the French failure is to be traced to the execution of that instrument by which the region embracing North America was ceded to Spain for ever. Spain was indeed the faithful supporter of the Papal power, but the gift was too large alike for the Castilian's greed and theological zeal. Thus the Pope, by pressing upon Spain responsibilities that she was not able to bear, at the same time took away one grand incentive to action from the people of France, who were eager to go forward in the paths of a fresh civilization.

Many writers have indeed expressed surprise because France did so little in the new world, especially during the first quarter of the sixteenth century. Under the circumstances, however, it is remarkable that anything was done or even thought of, since the Pope had solemnly pronounced a curse against whomsoever might presume, upon any pretense, to interfere with the rights of Spain,¹ by sending expeditions or colonies to the new world. Thus

¹ The Papal Bull has the following: "And we most strictly forbid every person whatsoever, and of whatsoever dignity (even imperial or royal), state, degree, order,

to the impotent folk was given the blessing, and upon the enterprise of a people who, long before the voyages of Columbus, had chased the whales into the North Sea, was laid a curse. The Papal power was defeated by its own blindness, suspending the activity of the only Catholic nation that was competent to plant the Roman faith in the central regions of North America, and thereby reserving those regions as a theatre for Protestant activity.

That the action of Pope Alexander was attended by such far-reaching results, is proved by the fact that every attempt at colonization by the French during the sixteenth century was denounced as a violation of ceded rights. As late as the seventeenth century Spain peremptorily demanded of England the abandonment of transatlantic settlements. The attempt on the part of France to colonize Canada in 1534 was tolerated, because that region lay so far to the north that it did not discommode Spain. The Spanish authorities declared that they could afford to let Cartier and Roberval alone, and abstained from armed intervention, for the reason that their attempt was sure to end in failure.

After this general statement of the Spanish policy, it will not be necessary to detail the opposition that was made in 1523 to the proposed voyage of Verrazano, who in 1524, finally engaged in the expedition which forms the subject of this article; the object of the voyage being, not colonization, because this was not thought of, but simply the discovery towards the west of a passage to the East Indies which would prove more direct than that opened by Magellan around South America. This indeed was the real design of the voyage of Cartier in 1534, who undertook to colonize the banks of the St. Lawrence, because, like Champlain in 1608, he believed the river communicated with the Pacific. The real object was India, and the colony in the frozen north was de-

or condition they may be, under the penalty of excommunication *latae sententiae*, which they will incur by the very fact of transgression, to presume, either for trafficking or for any other cause whatsoever, to approach, without special licence from you, and your foresaid heirs and successors, the islands and mainlands found, or that shall be found, discovered or that shall be discovered," etc., etc. Another Bull was bitter in its maledictions upon the transgressor.

signed to command the profitable passage against the world. But let us now proceed with our subject.

Giovanni Verrazano, the Florentine, was born about the year 1485, and lived during a period when the attention of Italians was turned in a remarkable degree towards maritime pursuits. Adopting the profession of the sea, he eventually entered the service of the King of France, in this respect following the example of distinguished fellow countrymen who led the marine enterprises of England, Portugal and Spain. Prior to the year 1524, he served in the navy of Francis I., and, like the great navigators of those times, acted more or less as a privateer. This was then a perilous yet respectable profession. His activity was directed chiefly against the Spaniards. In 1523 Verrazano captured two ships that were bringing the treasures of Montezuma, sent by Cortez from Mexico to Spain. The following year he sailed with a single caraval to seek the wished for western route to the Indies. Leaving a rock near Madeira, January 17th, and reaching the American coast in latitude 34° N.,¹ March 7th, he afterwards cruised northward, entered the harbor of New York, visited Newport, where he remained fifteen days, sailing thence northward probably to the shores of Cape Breton; and, finally shaping his course for France, arrived at Dieppe July 8th. From this port he addressed a letter to Francis I., giving an account of his voyage, while, in 1529, his brother Jerome referred to the voyage in a map² preserved to-day in the Museum of the Propaganda

¹ Near where Charleston now stands.

² After this article was finished the writer received a "supplement" to the work under notice that contains two documents from the archives at Rouen, which we had previously read in the "*Revue Critique*," published at Paris, and which are alluded to in the body of this article. In connection with these papers, which prove the fact previously stated, that Verrazano had a brother named Jerome, the author referred to says, "We are assured from Rome, on high authority, that this map appears to belong to a period subsequent to 1550." But upon this we need only to observe that the map of Verrazano lays down Florida about *nine degrees of Latitude north of its true position*, which was fixed scientifically nearly a quarter of a century prior to 1550, the result being published in Italy, in a printed form, for the benefit of the world. The map of Verrazano is on a parchment about eight feet long, and displays great scientific knowledge; and to fancy that the author was capable of putting Florida

Fide at Rome. In 1527, it is said, Verrazano fell into the hands of the Spaniards, and suffered an ignominious death. But upon August 4th, 1524, one Fernando Carli wrote from Lyons, informing his father, then at Florence, of the voyage, and enclosing a copy of Verrazano's letter to Francis. Some years since, this copy, together with the letter of Carli, was found in that city. Another Italian copy of Verrazano's letter found its way to Italy, and was published by the Historian Ramusio, in 1556. This copy does not possess the cosmographical treatise that is appended to the version of Carli. Upon the publication of the letter by Ramusio, the voyage of Verrazano became generally known, and to-day it forms an integral part of American history, the name of Verrazano being associated with that illustrious trio of Italian navigators, Cabot, Vespucci, and Columbus. And the authenticity of the voyage remained undisputed until 1864, when the late Buckingham Smith undertook to maintain that the letter addressed to Francis I. was a fabrication. This theory has been adopted and expanded by Mr. Murphy, who, however, fails to give any new facts, though the old ones are marshalled with ability and skill. The style of the work is also admirably clear, and the author has done a substantial service in defining the loosely drawn objections of his predecessor.

Speaking of the effect produced upon his mind by the confident oratory of Burke, who essayed to impeach the integrity of his famous East India Administration before the House of Commons, Warren Hastings said, "I verily thought myself guilty." And if Verrazano could read Mr. Murphy's indictment, drawn with the adroitness of the accomplished disputant, he might also fancy himself for the moment to be in the position of an impostor. In fact the plea put in by the doubter is quite plausible; yet it must be added that it is thoroughly fallacious. With the proper space at command, every position assumed, hostile to the claims of Verrazano, could be disposed of effectually; but at the present

nine degrees too far north, in the year 1550 or later, must appear inadmissible. Beyond question the map was drawn *before* the position of Florida was well known, and was not intended to illustrate the voyage of Giovanni Verrazano. It was probably drawn about the year 1522, and the reference to the voyage added in 1529. Besides, the fact remains that a Verrazano map is known to have existed in Italy in 1537.

time it will be necessary to confine our attention to a few points.

We do not object to this work, for the reason that it is devoted to a doubt. We may even sympathise with the honest endeavor to eliminate the false from the true, since progress, in a measure, is aided by doubt. In history it is a duty to look to the foundations, and to build upon what is real. But we believe that we have a right to ask for different tests than those afforded by the volume under consideration, when seeking to separate the true from the false, the wheat from the chaff. A test of a better description is found in connection with the spurious voyage of Ardré Thevet, the French monk and cosmographer, who in his great work, "Cosmographie Universelle," printed at Paris, 1575, tells us that he had coasted the continent of North America, and even visited the borders of Greenland, where he suffered extremely from the bitter cold. Helping himself to the relations of Jacques Cartier and others, he described our coast, and is quite minute in his account of the region of New England, whose aboriginal inhabitants, very unfortunately, he causes to speak in the language of the Canadian tribes, thinking that the vocabularies pilfered from Cartier would answer equally well for all the Indians on the Atlantic coast. The narrative of this mendacious man, who had really travelled much, but who, not satisfied with his deserved laurels, was ambitious to emulate the fame of the great explorers, came before the American public, having been drawn from the obscurity to which it had been consigned, by a German writer who was desirous of swelling the bulk of a manuscript prepared for the Maine Historical Society, by whose authority it was purchased in gross, the true and the false alike being given in their volume for 1869. The falsity of this monk's story, however, is apparent, not only from this narration of 1575, but from a prior work, "Les Singularités de la France Antarctique," published in 1558, wherein he tells us expressly that in the voyage to Brazil in 1556 he did not explore the American coast, and he excuses the paucity of his remarks concerning North America, on the ground that they did not go near the coast. In 1575 he had forgotten his own previous statements, or else took it for granted that his little book was forgotten, and fabricated the story which he gives in his ponderous tome.

But the story of Thevet, has nothing in common with the Letter of Verrazano, which is conceived in a style that no forger at that period would have ventured to employ ; for instead of dealing with vague general observations, which indeed was all that would have been required in order to make a claim to a discovery, the Letter of Verrazano is a mass of closely compacted statements, the product of a mind abounding with knowledge of the subject, the general correctness of which has been admired, and which cover various conditions, climates, productions, manners, customs, scenery and littoral characteristics from Florida to New Found-land. This was a task of which Italy was not capable at the time.¹

But let us now turn to the work of which it is proposed to treat. It is composed in an excellent spirit, and shows the best of intentions, containing ten chapters, which include a general

¹ The history of Thevet's attempted imposition, which the author first pointed out (see "The Northmen in Maine"), affords helpful suggestions in connection with the objections brought against the Letter of Verrazano. But it will also be found useful in this connection to consider the various opinions that have been encountered by the Zeno Narrative, published at Venice in 1558, giving an account of a voyage in 1380. The most serious attempts have been made to discredit that narrative, but it has of late come out from under the cloud, and many of the objections formerly brought against the authenticity of the work now only excite a smile. In opposing that narrative, Mr. Biddle, the able and ingenious author of a "Memoir of Sebastian Cabot," undertakes to show that it was composed, not at the early period assigned to it, but near the time of its publication in 1558, and was so arranged in its statements, as to agree with a false translation of the Letter of Pasqualigo, written in 1501, published in 1507 at Venice, and republished at Milan, in Latin, 1508. This Letter gave an account of the voyage of Cortereal to the Northern part of America in 1501, in which it is said that the country abounds with timber fit for masts and spars, but which, in the Latin translation, conveys the notion that the people of the region built ships. Mr. Biddle, in his zeal for his theory, with great ingenuousness seizes upon the facts and infers that he has an evidence of fraud upon the part of the author of the Zeno voyage, who writes thus in order to have a confirmation of his statement appear in the Letter of Pasqualigo. He has been copied, somewhat, in connection with Verrazano, but we now see clearly that his suspicions were all unfounded, and, moreover, the bad translation of the Letter was doubtless never intended. In translating the second Letter of Columbus, Mr. Magor brings out a phrase referring to boats, and describing them as *made of one log, as having one mast*. The writer may add here that his own proofs of the antiquity of the Zeno map, published in 1869-70 have been adopted by the Editor of the New Edition of the Zeno Voyage, published by the Hakluyt Society.

statement of the voyage ; an argument to show that the letter attributed to Verrazano is not genuine ; another to prove that no voyage whatever was made for Francis in 1524 ; a fourth dealing with the alleged misrepresentations of the coast ; a fifth designed to prove that the letter was corrupted by Ramusio, to disguise the writer's ignorance ; and a sixth to show that the letter fails to notice what is true of the natives of America, while what is "originally mentioned" of them is untrue. In the succeeding chapters the author strives to dispose of the "extrinsic evidence" which supports the claim of Verrazano ; maintains that the letter of Verrazano was constructed in its outlines from the voyage of Gomez made the year *after* ; and gives the concluding story of Verrazano, who was captured by the Spaniards in 1527. The appendix contains documents illustrative.

In treating of the injustice of the court which condemned Jean Calas to death, Voltaire points out the ease with which a verdict may be reached when "four-fourths" of the proof is assumption. Yet, with the different proportion employed in the work under notice, one may accomplish considerable, provided the method passes unnoticed. In the present case, however, this is not possible, and we must note that too much is taken for granted. This is notably the case where it is declared that the version of Verrazano's Letter published by Ramusio was drawn or "worked over" by that historian from the version of Carli, which, it is alleged, in the absence of proof, and in defiance of the internal testimony, was thus changed and corrupted by the dignified Italian, to conceal statements that he supposed to be inconsistent with the belief in its authenticity. The great convenience of this assumption is apparent, only when the whole discussion is carefully studied, and therefore it would be useless to treat it here with our insufficient space, even though it forms the key to much of the difficulty which has been created.

The only objection brought against the authenticity of the voyage of Verrazano that presents any appearance of strength, when subjected to the tests of criticism, is that drawn from an alleged absence of reference to the voyage during the Life of Francis I., who reigned until 1547. To say, however, that there is no such reference is unfair, since the discourse written by a

Dieppe Captain in 1539 makes a distinct reference to the event. And the reference in this discourse can be evaded only by declaring that it is an interpolation made at a subsequent time. This, indeed, is precisely the course pursued by Mr. Murphy, who, assuming that Ramusio formed a corrupt version of the Verrazano Letter from the version of Carli, also declares that the Italian corrupted the Dieppe Manuscript, and interpolated the reference of which we are speaking, to make it *appear* that the voyage of Verrazano was well known in 1539. This being done, in defiance of the internal testimony of the manuscripts, we cannot regard the charge otherwise than as an unwarrantable reflection upon the name of the Venetian geographer, who sustains the same relation to Italy that the honored Hakluyt enjoys in connection with England. Such is the method by which the author of the work before us would banish Verrazano from our annals in this the Centennial year. We must therefore reject, without qualification, the notion that the voyage had no contemporaneous recognition.

But though we have the reference of the Dieppe Captain in his discourse of 1539, and other proofs which it is not our purpose to refer to now, the commission or patent for the voyage probably given by Francis I., is actually wanting, together with other testimony that would prove interesting and valuable. Yet what does the absence of such testimony prove? Certainly it does not prove that such testimony does not or never did exist. This inference cannot be drawn before, nor even *after* the archives have been searched. It is well known, however, that the greater proportion of the French archives remain unexamined with special reference to this question. Many of the seaport towns have been neglected, while the archives of the important City of Rochelle have been completely destroyed by fire. Those of Dieppe suffered sadly by the English bombardment; and the archives of Paris even have not yet been fully explored. The collections of other countries must also be examined; for if the Pandects of Justinian were found at the obscure town of Amalfi, and important testimonies to the voyages of the Cabots were also discovered, at the end of three centuries and a half, in other obscure Italian alcoves, where may we not search for documents concerning Verrazano, when we remember the vicissitudes of Francis and his Government during the

disastrous year of 1524, in which the departments of State travelled from town to town, and from province to province? Indeed, we may look for testimony anywhere, even though at present obliged to find our chief source of information in that country hailed by generous Purchas, when he exclaims: "Happy Italy, that first in this last Age of the World, hath discovered the great discoverers of the World."

A vital error in this connection should be brought to the attention of the inquirer, for the real task of the doubter was to show, less where Verrazano *was not*, than where he *was*, from January 17th to July 8th, 1524, during which period the Letter claims that he was engaged in discovery upon the American coast. If the well-known navigator was not in American waters, where was he? Would any person interested in geographical research forge a letter giving an account of such a voyage at such a time by a navigator so famous, and run the risk of having the falsity of his narrative demonstrated by the exhibition of proof showing that this person was actually somewhere else during that particular period?

The voyage is attested, notwithstanding the absence of certain official papers, and we leave the author's objection with the reader, who will weigh its value; proceeding next to notice a few of the errors found in the work. We do this simply for the purpose of showing something of the character of a class of important statements that were intended to reflect upon the Letter of Verrazano.

Amongst the serious errors of fact sprinkled over the pages we may find one where it is said that the Patent for the occupation of the northern portions of America given by the King of France in 1593, was the first document emanating from the crown containing "any mention of any part of the Continent north of latitude 33° and south of Cape Breton;" from which it is argued that the French in the early times did not recognize any rights acquired within that region by any discovery, though this was a part of the region explored by Verrazano in 1524, and, consequently, that the French had no knowledge of such a voyage. This objection is technical; but, whether technical or general, it has no foundation in fact, since the patent of 1542 included the

region of "Hochelaga," which extended to the Mexican Gulf; while in the same connection it may be noticed that our author mistranslates the Cosmography of Alfonsee, putting the Cape of "Norumbega" in latitude 45° N., instead of 41°, and that the error is embodied in his map intended to define that region. A vital error must be pointed out, where the author says that the names, "Dieppa" and "Livorno," found in the map of Jerome Verrazano, are intended to show the southern limit of the voyage of Giovanni, his brother, and that, being placed in latitude 38° N., instead of at a point fifty leagues south of latitude 34° N., they contradict the letter and detract from its authority. If this were so, it would, however, prove nothing more than what is already evident, that there was no collusion between the author of the Letter and the maker of the Map to support a fraud. But our author is entirely incorrect in his supposition, since the names on the map have nothing to do with the definition of either the northern or southern limits of the alleged exploration. This is evident from the fact that Livorno and other names appeared upon a map drawn about twenty years earlier, and published in 1513. It is manifest, therefore, that a map maker possessing the intelligence and scientific knowledge that distinguished the author of the map of Verrazano could not have been so stupid as to select any name for the purpose alleged that had been used, as the world well knew, many years before. Jerome Verrazano drew the map without any reference to the voyage of his brother, which at the time had not been thought of, the references to the achievement being an afterthought, inserted in 1529, and without any reference to the statements of the Letter; while the identity of Jerome, whose very existence has been ridiculed by sceptics, is established by legal documents lately discovered in the archives of the Court of Appeals at Rouen.

The errors in the sixth chapter of this work are simply melancholy. The fraudulent character of the Letter of Verrazano being declared in the most positive phrases, because it fails to state that the American Indians used wampum and tobacco; thus overlooking the fact that many well-known explorers also say nothing with respect to these and other subjects. But "the most remarkable omission of all" is the failure to mention the bark canoe.

On the other hand, Verrazano says that the Indians of whom he speaks, when describing the New England Coast, made their canoes of logs hollowed out by fire. And, as it proves, Verrazano is *perfectly correct*; for Lescarbot and Champlain tell us that this continued to be the usage down to 1607. This "remarkable" evidence of fraud thus unexpectedly changes into a proof of *authenticity*, as the log canoe is one of those things "originally mentioned" in the Letter of Verrazano.

Our author's next step is to explain the *origin* of the remarkable Letter attributed to Verrazano, a Letter moreover that is destined to be more fully appreciated as time rolls on. The explanation is labored, and though invested with dry technicalities, is worthy of notice as one of the curiosities of geographical literature. This Letter, supposed to have been written by Verrazano, was, in its main features, we are assured, developed from the study of a map drawn in 1529 by Ribero, the Spanish geographer. We will state the theory as clearly as possible in a few words.

Finding that the Carli version of the Letter makes the total length of Verrazano's exploration upon the American coast 700 leagues, a distance comprehended between a point 50 leagues south of latitude 34° N. and 50° N., embracing nine courses (stated in round numbers as 50, 50, 100, 80, 15, 150, 50, 50, 150 leagues,) Mr. Murphy repairs to Ribero's Map, and, by a system of measurements, makes it appear that the distance between the two extreme points is the same, less only five leagues, and that the courses and the directions sailed, according to the Letter, agree with corresponding courses and directions upon the map. He therefore infers that the author of the letter never made the voyage, which must have been fabricated from the map. This theory may appear plausible, but it dissolves at the touch of impartial criticism. In this connection one might refer to the version of the letter given by Ramusio, which says that the distance run was 700 leagues and *more*, it being stated, also, that the fourth course included only 50, instead of 80 leagues; all of which indicates that distances are given simply as rough estimates, and therefore not thus calculable. But this is not the end of the objection to Mr. Murphy's theory. Now it must be observed distinctly that the

Letter mentions only three latitudes, 34° , $41^{\circ} 40'$, and 50° N. And more, this second latitude is given at the end of the *fifth* course, which, at the end of 295 leagues, reached latitude $41^{\circ} 40'$. as the letter describes Verrazano sailing from south to north. But upon turning to Ribero's Map we find that $41^{\circ} 40'$ is reached at the end of the *third* course after proceeding only 200 leagues. The whole theory, therefore, fails.

If it be said (*pour pis aller*) that the Letter does not mean that the fifth course terminated in latitude $41^{\circ} 40'$, then it must also be said that, on the same grounds, the landfall of 34° is equally unreliable. All this, however, would be mere quibbling, as it is evident that in giving the latitude $41^{\circ} 40'$ the writer of the Letter intended to be exact. This essential element in the calculation, which Mr. Murphy does not even mention, covers a crucial point; and its proper use upon the map demonstrates that the position of the sceptic is wholly untenable. As a confirmation of this statement, it should be noticed that, according to the Letter, latitude $41^{\circ} 40'$ was reached by sailing in a bend of the coast from West to East, a distance of ninety-five leagues, while upon the map all the region west of $41^{\circ} 40'$ is a part of the *solid continent*. In fact, this assumed demonstration carries its refutation upon its face; for while the *Letter* says that the evidences point to "various riches of gold and the like," describes an island of the size of Rhodes (45 miles long) near latitude 41° , and mentions no less than thirty-two islands lying within the eighth course of 50 leagues; Ribero's *map* says that the country is *poor* in gold, gives *no island* that forms more than a mere speck in the place where we should find one covering three-fourths of a degree of latitude, and places the *archipelagoes* on the other parts of the coast. The attempted demonstration of Chapter IX, like the rest of this work, is, in our judgment, a failure.

Some of these details may interest the reader inversely in proportion to their importance, yet at the present time when the annals of our country are being studied with fresh zeal and the spirit of iconoclasm is abroad, it becomes us to examine theories and ascertain the truth of sweeping conclusions before drawing black lines over some of the most interesting and important pages of American History.

At the risk of becoming tedious, we will illustrate the method by which our author would have us understand that the descriptions of the Letter were "analogized" out of Peter Martyr and others, though it should be observed that the part of Martyr's work which the author of the Letter is alleged to have used is the first book, published about a dozen years *before* the voyage of Verrazano. If, therefore, the charge were true, it would prove nothing, since it was the custom of the times for writers going over the same region to use one another's material without credit. Verrazano's own narrative was so used by subsequent voyagers for nearly a hundred years. To be of any real value the charge of plagiarism must be made good out of writers *subsequent to* 1524. But there is nothing whatever in the present attempts to show that the Verrazano Letter or any part of it, was "analogized" from Martyr. The author under examination, quoting Martyr, where he describes the arrival of Columbus at Hispaniola, gives the following :

"They saw ceertain men of the Islande, who perceiving an unknouen native comming towards them flocked together and ran into the thicke woodes, as it had bin hares coursed with greyhoundes. Our men pursuing them took only one woman, whom they brought to the ships, where filling her with meate and wine, and apparelling her, they let her depart to her companie." Then Mr. Murphy adds a paragraph : "Also, 'their boates are made only of one tree, made hollow with a certain sharpe stone, for they have no yron, and are very long and narrow.' And again, 'when our men went to prayer, and kneeled on their knees, after the manner of Christians, they did the like also. And after what manner soever they saw them pray to the crosse, they followed them in all poyntes as well as they could.'"

But it is to be noted that these three items are given out of their order and immediate connection. In Martyr, the mention of the women is followed by a long paragraph not quoted, then comes the mention of worship, and last the boats. Verrazano's language and thought are very different, and show no analogy to that of Martyr. The Florentine says that they "found the people had fled and hid themselves in the woods for fear. By searching around we discovered in the grass a very old woman

and a young girl of about eighteen or twenty, who had concealed themselves for the same reason ; [the old woman carried two infants on her shoulders, and behind her neck a little boy eight years of age ; when we came up to them they began to shriek and make signs to the men who had fled to the woods.] We gave them a part of our provisions, which they accepted with delight, but the girl would not touch any [everything we offered to her being thrown down in great anger. We took the little boy from the old woman to carry with us to France, and would have taken the girl also, who was very beautiful and tall, but it was impossible because of the loud shrieks she uttered as we attempted to lead her away ; having to pass some woods, and being far from the ship, we determined to leave her and take the boy only."] The above, *without* the parts in brackets, is adduced by our author to show that the account was "analogized" from Martyr. We need not point out the weakness of the suggestion, as we have placed the full account before our readers, which, in Martyr, is followed, at some distance, by the reference to the log canoes, concerning which Verrazano says they were made of one tree, twenty feet long and four broad, without the aid of stone or iron or other kind of metal," adding what is not in Martyr, "to hollow out their boats they burn out as much of a log as is requisite." On the whole, we have only to remark that here are two pairs of statements in two writers, referring to very common things, for, certainly it is no wonder that two adventurers entering a strange coast under similar circumstances should find the natives scampering into the woods. Savages who live upon the sea shore are not to blame for having log canoes, and the custom of such people when frightened is to run ; and how could they do better than to flee to the woods ? This was the experience of multitudes of early navigators. Roger Williams speaks of this custom. Cartier's first voyage, in connection with the mention of the Indian *canoes*, says that the men "caused all the young women to flee into the woods, two or three excepted," and the narrative tells how they got them out. Was this analogized from Martyr ? To find a parallel in Verrazano for Martyr's statement respecting the imitation of worship by Indians, several pages are skipped, and the *last* paragraph of the Letter is brought in and placed in immediate connection with the others ;

the indefensibility of which is too apparent to demand remark. In reality, it was a common thing for the natives of America to show regard for the white man's religion by imitating his actions, and with equal propriety we might say that Cartier analogized his idea from Martyr where he says that while he performed service the Indians "kept silence and were marvellously attentive, looking up to Heaven and imitating us in gestures." This was the common experience, and there is not a shadow of proof to show that Verrazano borrowed from Martyr, as we have already proved to be impossible with respect to the map of Ribero.¹

Still, our ungracious task is not quite finished; for the author, having given us the genesis of the Verrazano Letter, found it necessary to devise reason for the "imposture." We are told, in brief, that it originated about the year 1542 in Florence, that fair and enlightened city which Charles V. described as "sitting to be shown and seen only upon holidays," and that it was the outcome of "the spirit of civic pride." The end of the argument is in keeping with the beginning. It would be easier to digest any number of Verrazano letters than this brief phrase; which supposes that the forgers undertook the fraud while Francis was still alive; that no precautions were taken to prevent its premature publication in 1556, when the seaports were full of Frenchmen and Spanish spies, who, from personal knowledge, could deny the Verrazano claim, which was *never* denied; it is to suppose that untravelled Florentines possessed curious and exact information concerning New England, and knew more about Indian canoes than Mr. Murphy; it is to suppose that Ramusio, the learned historian of Venice and Secretary to the Council, con-

¹There is one more charge with respect to analogizing, where our author (p. 71) fancies that Verrazano drew on Martyr (Sec. 1, Lib. iv.), for his ideal of the "Cacique of Xaragua and his sister" when they visited the brother of Columbus in the West Indies; but it is not necessary. There is not even an *approach* to an undesigned coincidence. The real character of Mr. Murphy's sixth chapter will be appreciated after reading the article on Robertson in the previous number of this REVIEW. It will also be expedient in this connection to read Barlow (in Hakluyt, Vol. iii, p. 248) to notice how he describes the visit of "Granganimeo," the "King's brother," which he made to the ship with his wife; in immediate connection with which we have an account of the log canoe, and the method of burning them out.

spired, independently of the original movers, to aid the deception and flatter the "civic pride" of a rival city; it is to suppose that the Florentines took no proper means to preserve any papers relating to the voyage that might be referred to as *original* authorities, and never boasted of the alleged achievement of Verrazano, their fellow citizen; and finally, that they either deliberately selected for their hero one who perished infamously upon the gallows, or else in this deeply important matter took a leap in the dark. *Credat Judaeus Apella.*

But perhaps the question will recur, Why was such an important voyage so largely neglected by the French?

In replying, we might perhaps be permitted to recall the observation made at the outset, that a New France does not appear to have been contemplated in the Providential plan; while, on the other hand, the time was approaching when the English-speaking race was to perform its part upon the wide theatre of the world. That a special mission was reserved for the people of the British Isles, we might infer from what has been accomplished in this country during the hundred years now about closed. Nor should we regard this continent alone, for a more wonderful centennial even, is seen in India, where a population of two hundred and fifty millions, or about five or six times as large as that of the United States, has, during the last hundred years, been brought under English rule; a fact that appears all the more significant when it is stated that Russia has acquired in the same regions only twelve millions during *three* hundred years. The English-speaking race plainly had a mission. But we are treating a historic subject and must adhere to historic methods, and therefore we reply to the question proposed, that, however important in itself may have been the Verrazano Voyage, it possessed no especial importance to the French, who were, as already shown, debarred from occupying the country by the most solemn censures of the Church, censures that Monarchs respected. The aim of the voyage was to find a short route to the Indies. Failing in this, the French interest subsided for the time, even as Spanish zeal quite died out after the search for the Strait to the Indies by Estevan Gomez, who searched the American coast the year after the voyage of Verrazano.

But more. Upon the return of Verrazano to France in 1524, Francis was completely absorbed in the struggle with Spain, and was on the point of marching to meet the invader. A few months later the Monarch lay in prison, and his Mother reigned in his stead. The Queen Mother indeed took an enlightened view of the whole subject of exploration beyond the sea, but Strait to India there was none, and any project for colonization would have embarrassed the political situation, which needed the good offices, instead of the anathemas of Rome. And when Francis finally emerged from prison he found social order disrupted and the kingdom in ruins. Verrazano and his voyage were forgotten, and nothing more was said about a western route to India until 1534. Pinzon's parrots perhaps saved this country from a Castilian domination; and, after the blindness of Pope Alexander, America owes her freedom from the *regime* of France to that Franco-Spanish war. Here, then, we are dealing with things tangible; yet it might sometimes be well for critics in treating historical difficulties to think of the Unseen behind the Seen, and, in connection with the embarrassed action or enforced inactivity of a nation recognize the hand of God.

B. F. DeCOSTA.

THE CHURCH IN AMERICA, PARTICULARLY IN N. CAROLINA, IN ITS EARLY HISTORY.

It is a remarkable fact, which at once strikes the attention of the ecclesiastical inquirer, that all through these American States which were Colonies of Great Britain before 1776, whether among the Independents or Puritans in Massachusetts and Connecticut on the North, or among the Church of England Establishments in Maryland and Virginia, at the South, or among the more central Provinces, there never lived a Bishop of the English Church to ordain and perpetuate her ministry, to confirm her baptized, and perform other essential duties appertaining to the office of Bishop. This anomalous condition of things continued, till American Independence released this country from subjection to England, and left the Church here free to take measures for securing the Episcopate, of which she had been deprived for nearly 200 years. It is to the Church only, in contradistinction to the State, of England, that the Protestant Episcopal Church in these States, owns herself to be indebted under God, for her first foundation and a long continuance of nursing care and protection. To the English State she owes no gratitude; for that State only kept her in the trammels of State Bondage, and subjected her to the ever veering policy of Statesmen and Dissenters, both at home and abroad, whose interest it was, that the Church, though the Tree of the Lord, should not bear fruit after its kind, whose seed is in itself, for the propagation of itself. For as the Church receives the Primitive Constitution of her ministry as it exists in the Word of God, and in the Apostolic Ages, so no propagation by her ministry could be made except from that seed which Jesus Christ Himself first planted, when He chose His Apostles and said unto them: "As My Father hath sent Me, even so send I you." "Lo! I am with you always even unto the end of the world." Yet, for nearly 200 years, the

Church in this country was left without a Bishop upon its own ground. By customary usage, which seems to have taken its rise from his connection with the "Virginia Council" of which he was a member, the Bishop of London, from the year 1606, exercised spiritual jurisdiction over the American Plantations, which it was never expected that he should visit. In 1701, in the reign of William and Mary, the Charter of the "Venerable Society for the propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts," was obtained, and by this society missionaries from England were furnished to all the Colonies, except Maryland and Virginia which had their own establishments, up to the period of the American Revolution. But as all the clergymen who had come over prior to 1701 had been licensed by the Bishop of London, the practice was continued by the society, of placing its missionaries under the charge of the same Bishop. So that, in some sense, the Bishop of that See all along from 1606 up to the American Revolution, was the Bishop or Diocesan of all the English Colonies in America. This whole country formed, as it were, one enormous undivided Diocese under the nominal jurisdiction, so far as the Church of England was concerned, of a Bishop who was first brought into connection with it through one of the Virginia Companies, and lived 3000 miles off. Any actual oversight of such a Diocese was, of course, impracticable. The Churches in Maryland and Virginia, however, had deputies of the Bishop of London, under the name of commissaries, which none other of the English Provinces had. The duty of an ecclesiastical commissary, under the English Law, we are told, is "to supply the office and jurisdiction of the Bishop, in the outplaces of the Diocese." Of course, the rites of ordination and confirmation were not within his powers, since he was only a Presbyter. For certain purposes only of visitation through the Diocese, such as inspecting the state of the churches, delivering charges, and, in some instances, administering discipline though not to the extent of deposition, was he in the Bishop's room, and the Bishop's vicegerent. In 1689 the first commissary was duly commissioned by the Bishop of London for the Colony of Virginia. This officer was, as we have said, deputed to none other of the Provinces but Virginia and Maryland; and it appears from the history of those times, bad as they were, that even this

imperfect substitute for episcopal supervision, was of signal service to the Church in these parts, though the office fell into disuse before 1760.

As far back as 1672, in the reign of King Charles II., it had been resolved by the King in Council, to send a Bishop to Virginia, and Dr. Alexander Murray, who had been the companion of the King in his travels, was the person nominated to be Bishop of Virginia, with a general charge over the other Provinces. His Letters Patent, but not signed by the King's name, it is stated by Gibson, Bishop of London fifty years afterwards, were extant among the records of that See; but the design of consecrating him fell through, it is asserted, *because the endowment was made payable out of the customs.* It was the era of "the Cabal Ministry," who thought little and cared less for the Church, either at home or abroad, and had no mind, at any rate, that it should be a tax on the revenues.

As we have before said, the Venerable Society for the propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts had been founded in 1701, the last year of William and Mary's reign—an important era in the history of the Colonial Church of America, because it was this society which became the chief source of support to the Church Ministers in the Colonies, except those of Maryland and Virginia. Its missionaries, at times to the number of 100, were at work at almost every important town on the Atlantic coast. Three distinct and urgent applications for an American Episcopate are recorded in the reigns of Queen Anne and George I., under the auspices of this society; but just when they were on the point of obtaining all they desired, some untoward event, occasioned either by death or by political troubles, would frustrate their plans. The society had even gone so far as to purchase at Burlington, N. J., in the year 1710, at an expense of £600, a convenient Mansion-House, which was also put in thorough repair, together with 15 acres of land and 12 acres of meadow, for the use of the future Bishop, whose charge, as designated, extended "from the East side of Delaware River, to the utmost bounds Eastward of the British Dominions, including New Foundland;" while another Bishop was designed to be settled at Williamsburg, Va., to whom was allotted the district extending "from the West side of the

Delaware River, to the utmost bounds Westward." But this, as well as another plan in 1726 for consecrating a Suffragan in Maryland to the Bishop of London, came to nought.

But as the century waned on after 1750, the chances of obtaining a Bishop for America, became more and more hopeless, though vigorous efforts were still made for that purpose. Difficulties and misunderstandings with the Mother Country began to thicken; and the odium which raged against the political measures of England, especially the stamp duty of 1764 was zealously turned by the enemies of the Church, against the Church herself. The hostile denominations, both in this country and in England, concentrated their forces against the Church, in a committee in London which carried on constant correspondence with a kindred committee in this country, forming together a sort of anti-episcopal "League and Covenant." The English Ministry sought to disarm their opposition by frowning down the revived scheme of the Bishop of London for sending over Bishops to America, and by giving assurance to the agitators that no Bishop should be consecrated for America without *their* consent.

It was about this period, 1765, that a controversy broke out between a Church Clergyman of Cambridge, Mass., and a Dr Mayhew, a Congregational Minister of Boston, concerning the course that had been pursued by the "Society for propagating the Gospel in Foreign Parts," which, the congregationalist charged, instead of sending the Gospel and the ministry to the destitute parts of the continent, had sought out the better settled and more comfortable portions of the country and there stationed its missionaries as intruders upon the descendants of the first settlers. He also inveighed against the plan of appointing Bishops for America.

This controversy is remarkable chiefly as having been participated in by Secker, then Archbishop of Canterbury and ex-officio President of "the Venerable Society, etc." In his tract, he had occasion to assign the reasons for desiring the appointment of Bishops, which furnish a graphic picture of the grievances under which the Church in America labored. The principal reasons assigned by him for desiring a Bishop, are, the want of confirmation of the baptized, the need for superintendence of the clergy, and especially the saving candidates for Holy Orders the trouble,

cost, and risk of a voyage to and from England. While all denominations had the means within themselves of perpetuating their ministry, the members of the Church of England alone, he says, were excluded from a right whose exercise was, in their view, essential to their existence, as a Church. Would they think themselves tolerated, were they obliged to send all their candidates for the ministry to Geneva or Scotland? The expense of the voyage to and from England he sets down at not less than £100; nearly one fifth of those who had taken that voyage had lost their lives either by shipwreck or by sickness, and in consequence of these discouragements, one-half of the Churches in many of the Provinces were destitute of Clergymen. The Archbishop went on to state, that the proposed Bishops were never designed to have any concern with persons who do not profess themselves to be of the Church of England, but to ordain ministers for the members of that Church, to confirm their children when brought to them at a fit age, and take oversight of the Episcopal Clergy. But it was not desired in the least that they should be vested with any temporal authority, exercised either by provincial Governors or subordinate Magistrates, or infringe upon or diminish any privileges or liberties enjoyed by any of the laity even of our own Communion.

It thus appears, from the foregoing declarations, that an English Archbishop of Canterbury, taught by the situation of affairs over in this country, had worked his way out from the hampering bonds of a Legal Establishment, to the puré conception of an Episcopate exercising only spiritual functions of office, and especially disclaiming any connection at all with the functions of the State. Such was Archbishop Secker's idea of the proposed American Episcopate. Such was the primitive idea before the time of Constantine. Such is the true American idea. The time was not yet come, in the order of Divine providence, for realizing it in fact. But there was something, at least, gained in the Church having been educated up to that point of a scriptural and primitive Episcopate, friend and foe thus becoming familiarized with the conception. In due time, a watchful providence would take care to prepare the way and the time for its full realization. But the storm of an eight years' war was destined first to sweep

over the land and reduce all things to chaos, ere the States, and with them the Church, could emerge free and independent, to begin together their new career. Of course, the whole subject of the Episcopate remained in abeyance during the Revolutionary War. Of the Clergy of the Church of England some took sides with the American Patriots; others chose to transfer their services to Colonies of the British Crown, the West Indies, the Bermudas, particularly Nova Scotia, which became in 1787 the first Colonial See of the English Church, on this Continent. Others of the Clergy closed their Churches, remained at home and opened schools, but with limited success—for the war of the revolution left the youth of the day but little opportunity for education. The mass of the Church of England Laity, among them such men as General Washington, Patrick Henry, Richard Henry Lee the mover of the Declaration of Independence, Francis Lee one of the signers, the Carringtons and Graysons and Mercers, with hundreds of other names well-known to fame, took sides against England; for the quarrel of all these great men was with *the State of England*, not with *the Church of England*, in which they had been baptized and to which they remained faithful, through the conflict of arms, to draw their last breath in the peace of her Holy Communion. Peace was proclaimed in America on the 19th April, 1783; but it dawned upon a land, especially through the rural districts, with roofless and forsaken churches, with broken altars and a scattered and diminished Clergy!

But to everything under the sun, the wisdom of Solomon tells us, belongs a time or crisis, which, if embraced, stamps human efforts with success, but is followed by ruin, if it be past or lost. To the Church that survived the wreck of war, the blessing of God was given to improve its crisis, in a signal manner, for all time to come.

The first General Convention of this Church, after two preliminary meetings of Clergy and Laity from different States, assembled in Christ Church, Philadelphia, in the month of September, 1785. The two most important subjects which came before this body were (1) the preparation of a general Ecclesiastical Constitution, and (2) the adaptation of the Liturgy of the Church of England to the altered situation of the American Church—both of which objects were at length happily accomplished.

The General Convention met again the following year (Oct. 1786), among other purposes, to consider the answer that had been received by the Church Committee appointed to correspond with the English Bishops concerning the consecration of Bishops for the Church in the United States. That answer being favorable to their consecration, Drs. White, of Philadelphia, and Proovost, of New York, were invested with the office of Bishop, 4th Feb., 1787, in Lambeth Chapel, by the Archbishop of Canterbury, assisted by the Archbishop of York and the Bishops of Bath and Wells, and of Peterborough. To these two, Dr. Madison, of Virginia was afterwards added, having been consecrated in Lambeth Chapel, 19th September, 1790. And thus was "the Protestant Episcopal Church" in this country, the old Church of England, after nearly two centuries of waiting, and longing, and pleading, furnished with *three Bishops*, thus becoming qualified, according to the oldest Canons in existence, to propagate its own line of Apostolic succession, "even unto the end of the world."

But now we turn back a little to another interesting chapter in American Church History. Nearly three years before the consecration of Bishops White and Provoost in England, that is, in 1784, another line of Episcopacy, through the Scottish line of succession, had been introduced into New England, under these circumstances. In 1782 a plan designed as a temporary substitute for Episcopacy had been published by Dr. White, a sort of superintendency or moderatorship in the person of a Presbyter, that was supposed by him to be justified by the necessity of the case. The plan was professedly to give way or be superseded whenever lawful Bishops could be obtained. Had this scheme been adopted, as was recommended by the high authority of Dr. White, it would probably have ended, like all other schemes of the kind in the history of the Church, professedly at first temporary and designed to meet exigency, in becoming a permanent sectarian organization with its blind following of the multitude. The proposed plan gave great alarm to the Church in Connecticut, which, having been trained by continual combat with the Puritans, in Church principles, was determined to stand or fall by the Church of Holy Scripture and Primitive Antiquity. Accordingly, the moment that peace was declared in 1783, they elected Dr. Samuel Seabury

for their Bishop, furnished him with testimonials and sent him to England for consecration. But the English Bishops could not consecrate a Foreigner without a special Act of Parliament, which was refused to them. After waiting in England more than a year, with no prospect of success, the Clergy of Connecticut directed their Bishop-elect to proceed to Scotland where he was consecrated at Aberdeen, 14th Nov., 1784, or nearly three years earlier than Drs. White and Provoost. Bishop Seabury, on returning to his Diocese, went vigorously to work, but for several years took no part in the proceedings outside of his own Diocese. We are indebted to this staunch old Bishop, it may be mentioned in passing, for the insertion in the Prayer of Consecration in the Communion office, of the Invocation of the Holy Ghost "to bless and sanctify the Creatures of Bread and Wine," after the Use of the Scottish Communion office, which is not found in the English office.

As yet there was no union among the Episcopal Churches in the United States; only, a large nucleus for a general union existed among the States southward of New England, comprising New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, North and South Carolina. But there was a sincere desire felt for general union of the whole Church, which was sure to work its way, in due time, to the desired end. By the time of the adjourned meeting of the General Convention of 1789, the New England Churches had all acceded to the General Constitution, adopted during the previous session of that Convention.

It is an interesting fact that the Convention of 1789, which witnessed the Union of the Church under a Constitution, witnessed also in the same year the Union of the States under the Constitution of the United States. That Convention also presented an Address to Washington which they opened with saying "that with the highest veneration and the most animating national considerations we express our cordial joy on your election to the Chief Magistracy of the United States." President Washington, after heartily thanking them for their affectionate congratulations, closed his reply with this memorable benediction, "May you and the people whom you represent be the happy subjects of Divine benediction, both here and hereafter!" May the bene-

diction thus invoked by the Father of his Country be abundantly fulfilled through the ages!

At this point, looking back, we pause to note the remarkable synchronisms between the dates and great epochs of our civil and ecclesiastical history. This Church and the American States had their Colonial training together up to 1775. After that year, they passed through the trying ordeal of the eight years' struggle, each reduced to the lowest extremity and almost laid in ruins. With 1783, on the return of peace, began their common era of uprising and resuscitation. The year 1789 marks the era of time when the National Constitution and the Constitution of this Church, as a National Church, both went into operation; and we ourselves know, from the events of our own day, how the fortunes alike of Church and State have again synchronized in division and in re-union. History, as the order of ages rolls onward, in its divinely purposed manifestation of results will evolve more and more luminously the plan of Divine wisdom that lies hidden in such wonderful coincidences of times and events—"series juncturaque rerum."

Before closing the review of our early Church History, it may be interesting to notice, as a matter of history, what was the professed relation of the Methodists in those times, to the Church of England in America; for it was as far back as 1735 that John and Charles Wesley, *both of them Presbyters of that Church*, came over to America, where, during a stay of about three years, they gathered the rudiments of a Methodist society. From that time onward, and all through the war of the Revolution, the Methodists professed to consider themselves as belonging to the Church of England, claiming for their preachers to be only lay-preachers and resisting every attempt to set up for themselves, as a Church, for the administration of the Sacraments. Their separation from the Church of their baptism did not take place till 1784, after the war was over, when Mr. Wesley appointed Dr. Coke and Mr. Francis Asbury to be joint *Superintendents* over the Methodists in this country, and also two others to act as elders among them, in baptising and administering the Lord's supper, *for the first time*. Wesley, in England, laid hands upon Coke, who was already a Presbyter of the Church of England, like himself.

Coke thereupon came over to America and laid hands upon Asbury, one of the lay-preachers of the Society. Such was the beginning and origin of "Methodist Episcopacy" or rather "Methodist Superintendency." For Mr. Wesley, the father of Methodism, never designed either Dr. Coke or Mr. Asbury to bear the title of "Bishop," whatever else was his purpose in laying hands upon Dr. Coke. The proof of this fact is taken from Lee's History of Methodism, wherein he affirms that in the year 1787 (or three years after the assembling of the first General Conference in Baltimore under Superintendent Coke), Mr. Asbury reprinted the General Minutes of that Conference in a different form and under a different title from what they were before, styling them "A form of discipline for the ministers, preachers and members of the *Methodist Episcopal Church* in America, etc." In this reprint of the Discipline, he altered the title of "Superintendent" into that of "Bishop." "*This was the first time,*" says Lee, "*our Superintendents ever gave themselves the title of Bishops in the Minutes. They changed the title themselves, without the consent of the Conference.*" This alteration of title, contrary to Mr. Wesley's intention, was energetically resented by him, in a letter written to Mr. Asbury, under date of September, 1788, from which we take the following extract: "How can you, how dare you, suffer yourself to be called *Bishop*. I shudder, I start at the very thought. Men may call me a knave, or a fool, or a rascal, or a scoundrel, and I am content, but they shall never, by my consent, call me *Bishop*. For my sake, for God's sake, for Christ's sake, put a full end to this!"

And Superintendent Coke himself, in a letter addressed to Bishop White, dated April 24, 1791, and published in White's Memoirs, confesses—"I am not sure but that I went farther in the separation of our Church in America, than Mr. Wesley, from whom I had received my commission, did intend. He did indeed solemnly invest me, *as far as he had a right so to do*, with Episcopal authority, but did not intend, I think, that an entire separation should take place. This I am certain of, that he is now sorry for the separation."

But had Mr. Wesley waited a little longer on God's time, which is always man's best opportunity, he would have been

saved from that rash act done by him at Bristol, the ultimate consequences of which to the cause of Christianity in this country no human vision can foresee. For, as we have seen, about this very time (1784), Dr. Seabury, Bishop-elect of Connecticut, was on the point of leaving England for Scotland, for the purpose of receiving consecration at the hands of the Scottish Bishops. And in point of fact, he had received consecration 14th November, 1784—more than five weeks before Superintendent Coke had met the Conference at Baltimore, on returning to America.

Mr. Wesley could hardly have been ignorant of these facts concerning Dr. Seabury, as they were the talk of the time; and they were well known to his brother Charles, who expressed his mind concerning them in a letter to Dr. Chandler, of New Jersey, from which we extract at some length :

I can scarcely believe that in his eighty-second year, my brother, my old intimate friend and companion, should have assumed the Episcopal character, ordained Elders, consecrated a Bishop, and set him to ordain lay-preachers in America. I was then at his elbow in Bristol, yet he never gave me the least hint of his intention. What will become of those poor sheep in the wilderness—the American Methodists? How have they been betrayed into a separation from the Church of England which their preachers and they, no more intended, than the Methodists here? Had they had patience a little longer they would have seen a *real* primitive Bishop in America, duly consecrated by the Scotch Bishops who have their consecration from the English Bishops and are acknowledged by them as the same with themselves. There is not, therefore, the least difference betwixt the members of Bishop Seabury's Church and the members of the Church of England. You know that I had the happiness to converse with that truly Apostolic man, who is esteemed by all who know him as much as by you and me. He told me he looked upon the Methodists in America as sound members of the Church, and was ready to ordain their preachers whom he should find duly qualified. *His ordination would indeed be genuine, valid and Episcopal.* But what are your poor Methodists now? Only a new sect of Presbyterians.

Such was the judgment of Charles Wesley, the sweet singer of Methodism, concerning his brother John's act in laying hands upon Coke. But as late as 1789, five years after that act, John Wesley himself made this declaration.

I declare once more that I live and die a member of the Church of England, and that none who regard my judgment or advice will ever separate from it.

Our limits forbid more than a condensed notice of the Early Church in North Carolina. Its history is best gleaned from the

abstracts of the Letters of the Missionaries supported here by the "venerable Society for the propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts." These were required by the Society's rules, to send over their reports every six months. The impression left on our mind on reading years ago those abstracts, published in England during the colonial times in a sort of "Spirit of Missions" periodical, was, that the colonial clergy of North Carolina, though quite few in number, were a most faithful and hard-working band of men. Indeed, as a general thing, the Venerable Society's Missionaries, both in this and the other Provinces, were the choice ministers of that day on this Continent. Very few ministers of the Gospel, in these after times, will have it recorded of them, at the end of their labors, as is recorded of Rev. Mr. Hall, one of the Society's Missionaries in North Carolina, who died in 1759, that he had baptised 10,000 persons, including children and white and black adults, and had traveled 35,000 miles as travel was in those days, besides visiting the sick and distributing tracts.

A few statistics, drawn from the Society's correspondence and other sources, are here presented, with their respective dates:

In 1701, the year of the Society's charter, North Carolina contained 5,000 inhabitants, besides Negroes and Indians, who all lived without any form of public worship and without schools.

In 1705, or about two years after the establishment of the Church by law in North Carolina, the first church was erected in the Chowan District, nor is it known up to 1728, which marked the close of the Proprietary Government, that more than two churches had been erected in the Province of North Carolina.

In 1725, there were eleven Parishes or Precincts containing near 10,000 Christian souls, without one minister of the Gospel to officiate among them.

In 1732, after a previous exploration of the Province by the Rev. Mr. Blair, the first Itinerant Missionary, Mr. Boyd, was sent over by the Venerable Society. He found there not a single minister of the Gospel, besides himself.

In 1745, Mr. Hall writes, "No clergyman of the Church of England in North Carolina, that I can hear of, but myself and Mr. Moir."

In 1755, the population amounted to near 80,000, with but five

Episcopal ministers. Five years later still, there were but eight clergymen left in the Province to officiate in 29 counties or parishes. Meanwhile, the population was rapidly increasing, having trebled itself within the thirty years before the Revolution.

The Parishes or Precincts into which the Province of North Carolina was divided, were Counties of immense extent, lying northward and southward of Neuse River and bounded within Cape Fear River and the coast. Once or twice there were attempts made to establish Missions in the country westward of the Cape Fear among the Catawbas in Mecklenberg County, but we read of no results. To perform their ministrations in these Countries constant travelling was required on the part of the Missionaries. The Methodists afterward borrowed this Itinerant feature of the Society's Mission work and incorporated it, with great effect, into their system. Indeed, after we leave the towns, especially amid the sparse population of a new country, there is no other way of regularly reaching the people than by the Itinerant mode, and a few zealous ministers, by this means may be enabled to supply the indispensable demands of church people, as well as extend the Gospel, over an immense territory. But the Colonial Church of North Carolina had also her centres and strong points in the towns of Edenton, Wilmington, New Berne and Bath, where there were churches, schoolhouses, chapels and other parochial conveniences. Not, however, till 1763, was finished the first and probably the only Glebe House in the Province, and that was in St. Thomas' Parish, Bath.

To give some idea of the relative proportions of the members of the Church of England, especially in Eastern North Carolina, to the rest of the inhabitants, at different times before the Revolution, we quote from the Report of the Missionaries. In 1761, Mr. Reed, Missionary in Craven County, computes about 2,500 whites there, of whom about 1,800 were members of the Church of England, the rest Protestant Dissenters of various names, except about nine or ten Papists.

Rev. Mr. Stewart, of St. Thomas' Parish, Bath, computes 2,200 whites there, seven-eighths of whom belonged to the Church of England.

In 1765 Governor Tryon wrote to the Society :

That every sect abounded except the Romanists, but he reckons the Church of England to have the majority in the Province, and doubts not that the greatest part of every sect would come over, could a sufficient number of exemplary and orthodox clergy persuade themselves to settle in this country.

But it was in vain for the Church of England to seek long to hold her own against such increasing odds when the Province was rapidly filling up from abroad with Germans, dissenting English, Irish and Scotch, and she herself was without any source of supply, for her clergy, short of the Mother Country. For her clergy's support, there was only an establishment by law, in name, without revenues. Their principal means of support was the £50 sterling, which the Venerable Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, allowed to each of its Missionaries.

A letter of Parson Miller, who died in the adjoining County of Burke, some years ago, furnishes us with these interesting particulars. He states that he made his first essay as a lay-preacher with the Methodists, when they professed to be members of the Church of England. But in the year 1784 he accompanied Dr. Coke to a Conference in Franklin County, in this State. He says :

Our chief conversation, during the time I was with him, which was for some weeks, was on the subject of organizing what they call their Episcopal Church, on which we could not agree, as the idea was early and deeply fixed in my mind, and I may truly say, my conscience, that the Apostolical Succession must ever descend and continue unbroken with the Church of God. And however inconsistent with this assertion some of my subsequent conduct may appear to be, yet, at this moment, I am certain it is the truth.

The inconsistency he refers to, was his leaving the Methodists on that scruple, and afterward receiving ordination among the Lutherans in Rowan County of this State, who, however, in the letters of orders they gave him, expressly reserved his right to attach himself to the ministry of the Protestant Episcopal Church, should the Providence of God ever afford him an opportunity; which opportunity he afterward enjoyed and embraced at the hands of Bishop Moore, of Virginia.

The first public effort of the Church in North Carolina after the Revolution, to recover herself, was made in the year 1790, November 12th, by a Convention appointed to meet at Tarboro'.

They elected deputies to represent them in the General Convention of 1792, also a Standing Committee. For the two subsequent years no Convention met; but during that interval Rev. Dr. Halling was ordained by Bishop Madison, of Virginia, which was the first ordination after the Revolution, held expressly for the Church in North Carolina. He became Rector of Christ Church, New Berne.

Another Convention was held at Tarboro', May, 1794, when Rev. Charles Pettigrew, one of the five clergy that are known to have remained steady at their posts in North Carolina during the Revolutionary War, was elected to be Bishop of the Diocese of North Carolina. Bishop White states in his Memoirs that Mr. Pettigrew set off to attend the General Convention for the purpose of being consecrated, but was unable to reach Philadelphia in time. Parson Miller, in the published letter before referred to,¹ states that he had it from Mr. Pettigrew himself, that he thought the election of a Bishop premature, and that he submitted to the election of himself only to prevent the acceptance of the office by some one else. A dreary night set in upon the Church in this State, and indeed over the United States. In 1811 there was not a single candidate for Holy Orders in the American Church, and Bishop White feared that it would again be compelled to have recourse to the Church of England for the renewal of its Bishops. A wide-spread spirit of infidelity, caught from France, had infected all grades and classes of society. In the front ranks of infidels were to be found those whose forefathers had been the children and zealous friends of the Church. But in 1819 the tide began to turn. Bishop Moore opens his notice of the visitation he paid to the Church in North Carolina in 1819, with these words: "The Church in that State is rising in all the vigor of youth."

The Rev. John Stark Ravenscroft was consecrated the first Bishop of North Carolina during the session of the General Convention at Philadelphia, May, 1823. It is not our purpose to follow the subsequent history and progress of the Church in this State, under her line of Bishops.

¹ CHURCH REVIEW, July, 1850.

We have seen from the present survey that this Church is the old Church of North Carolina, for a long time the Church of the majority of its population, notwithstanding the grievous disadvantages she labored under from the necessity of supplying her ministry from beyond the sea, for want of her own Bishop ; and that historically and synchronically she has been associated with the life of the State, whether in prosperity or adversity.

What the American Church most pressingly wants now, what she ever has wanted and ought to pray for, never so earnestly as now, in prospect of plenteous returns, is, that her Lord would send forth more laborers into the harvest.

“They shall prosper that love Thee. Peace be within Thy walls and plenteousness within Thy palaces ; for my brethren and companion’s sake, I will wish Thee prosperity.”

JARVIS BUXTON.

CENTENNIAL THOUGHTS.

This Hundredth Anniversary of the birth of our republic is to be a Jubilee in the most popular sense of the word. If no attention was paid to the expiration of the first fifty years of our national existence, we shall certainly make up for it this time, and with interest. There is to be a large amount of jubilation, but I fear we are, in some degree, rejoicing without reason ; and wherein we have cause for joy there is far too little of the spirit *Jubilate Deo.*

It seems an ungracious thing to croak when every body else is singing, but I cannot help thinking there is too much shallow exultation in our Centennial celebration.

Certainly there is much to be thankful for, and proud of, in our scientific and commercial progress, and much to criticize; but let that pass just now ; what I am particularly deprecating is our political vain glory. Doubtless we possess some of the blessings of civil liberty, and many of the social advantages of civilization ; but are we not accustomed to boast of these things, rather than to thank God for them ?

We complacently attribute to the form of our government, the intrinsic merit of producing the peace and prosperity we enjoy. And yet it requires but a glance at history to teach us that there is no such inherent virtue in the republican system as that we credit to it. We have but to recall Athens and the Achæan League, Consular Rome, and the first French republic, in order to refute any such assumption. Does not an historical comparison show us that the stability and security we have enjoyed under our republic are to be ascribed to the influence of Christianity ?¹

¹The French republic though a part of Christendom, was essentially anti-christian.

Do we not see this same beneficent influence giving personal liberty and tranquility to a constitutional monarchy like England, and a measure of these blessings to a Christian despotism in Russia ?

If then we owe the success of our government, if we owe the safety of the very foundations of society to Christianity, is it not our wisdom and duty to watch narrowly all anti-Christian influences if we would preserve and transmit our civil privileges ?

I believe there is an influence at work in modern society which is rapidly undermining the foundations of civil liberty,—nay, the very corner stone of social order; a danger compared with which such questions as currency and tariff sink into utter triviality; an issue, not between existing parties, but between government and anarchy,—between Christ and Belial.

Let us learn a political lesson from the New Testament. The record of our Lord's trial and Crucifixion is full of profoundly significant lessons. There seemed to be crowded into the events of that awful day an epitome of the world's history. It was when the cruel mockery of a trial was well nigh concluded. The subtle charges concocted by the Sanhedrim had been presented. The false witnesses had given their infamous testimony. The Divine Man had suffered the mocking, the buffeting, the spitting. It was evident that the noble prisoner was innocent, and yet the Procurator hesitated. The Jewish leaders were present with their threatening intimations of complaint to the Emperor,—“ If thou let this man go, thou art not Caesar's friend : ” and a clamorous rabble was there breathing tumult. Thus menaced the Governor is irresolute, and seeks to escape the responsibility of convicting or acquitting the accused, so he seized upon the custom of releasing some prisoner at the festival and asked—“ whom will ye that I release unto you Barabbas or Jesus ? ” which would they choose for executive clemency, the embodiment of virtue, or the robber, the murderer, the mover of sedition ? “ And they cried out all at once, saying away with this man, and release unto us Barabbas.”

Now, what were the determining motives of that decision ? Why away with the Messiah, the hope of Israel, and claim pardon for a criminal ? The men composing that mob, had in common

with the whole Jewish people, been long expecting the Messiah ; but they expected a second Joshua, a military leader, a temporal monarch, who should be able to lead them out of Roman subjugation, and re-establish the Kingdom of Israel. Under the regime of the Messiah, they had indulged dreams of a return of those haleyon days when the land flowed with milk and honey ; they looked forward to the time when they should sit every man under his vine and under his fig tree, and none should make them afraid. But their hopes of national prosperity were doomed to disappointment. The meek and lowly Jesus, teaching that His Kingdom was not of this world, was not what they were looking for. A Messiah sanctioning the paying tribute money to Caesar, and predicting the destruction of the Temple, and the overthrow of Jerusalem, was to their carnal minds preposterous to the last degree.

But that was not all ; the distinctive feature of Christ's social code was exasperating to their gross, hard natures. " Whosoever shall humble himself as this little child, the same is greatest in the kingdom of heaven ; " " Whosoever will be great among you, let him be your minister, and whosoever will be chief among you let him be your servant." " Every one that exalteth himself shall be abased ; and he that humbleth himself shall be exalted." Such were Christ's precepts ; and such precepts did not suit the seditious purposes of an ambitious populace. There was no encouragement in all this for resistance to the civil authority, nor for the subversion of the existing order of society. These people were eager enough to follow the Master and laud His name when the loaves and fishes were distributed ; and " the common people heard Him gladly " when He was confounding the learning, and denouncing the ostentation of the aristocratic Scribes and Pharisees ; and yet these same " common people " permitted themselves to be hounded on by those Pharisaic demagogues to destroy their Saviour. The motive of these leaders was transparent even to Pilate,— " for he knew that for envy they had delivered Him." No language is too invective to describe the pitiful weakness, the contemptible cowardice, nay, the wicked faithlessness of that vacillating governor, who permitted threat of Pharisee and mob rage to turn him from the course of justice.

Here, then, was the meaning of that cry—"away with this man and release unto us Barabbas." The insubordinate, vicious element of society, disappointed in its Utopian hopes of worldly aggrandizement, irritated by the reproachful presence of a nature infinitely superior to it, instigated to violence by the unprincipled aspirants for popular favor, takes advantage of truckling authority, and tramples upon justice and virtue; venting its brutal rage in the commission of the pre-eminent crime of all history.

The parallel is still further illustrated in the infatuation which drove that ancient rabble to insurrection against the Roman government, and in the horrible crimes committed by them during the siege of Jerusalem.

The cry of that Jewish mob is echoed by the shout of the "Commune,"—that organized anarchy which showed its *animus* so unmistakably in Paris, during the late Franco-German war.

That spirit is rife to-day; it is the very soul of the "International" as the demon of discord now styles itself. It has its branches in every country in Europe, and no doubt its agents are at work in this country. The Trade Union strikes throughout the country and the insurrections amongst the Pennsylvania miners indicate the influence of the spirit of that infamous society.

The whole spirit of this agrarian, levelling movement is anti-Christ. It is the same principle whose mutterings St. Paul rebuked in his epistle to the Romans—"Let every soul be subject unto the higher powers, for there is no power but of God; the powers that be are ordained of God; whosoever therefore resisteth the power, resisteth the ordinance of God. * * * Render therefore to all their dues, tribute to whom tribute is due; custom to whom custom; fear to whom fear; honor to whom honor." It is the creed of "the International" that no tribute, custom, fear or honor is due to any one.

This spirit is shown, not only in such outbreaks as that of the French Commune, and our Trade Union strikes, but in the prevalence of an unreasoning hatred of the unchristianized poor toward the rich, and in a jealousy of the influence of culture which manifests itself in the very bitterness with which the word "aristocracy" is uttered by this class; always as an epithet, and

sometimes with a tone and expression that signify "torch and sword to every thing above me."

It is believed that we have had a foretaste of Red-republicanism in the terrible fires which have desolated Chicago, Boston and Virginia City ; produced by this demoniac agency for the purpose, it has been suggested, of creating at once, an opportunity for pillage, and a demand for labor.

Are we to have all the horrors of the French revolution upon us ? Are we to witness the overthrow of lawful authority, and the demolition of public and private buildings ? Are our streets to run with the blood of men and women, slaughtered for the single offence of gentility ? Is the Christian religion to be abolished in this land, and a representative of impurity enthroned in holy places ? In a word are we to have Barabbas turned loose upon us ? We certainly have portents of such experience.

We are apt to flatter ourselves that this social monster is not likely to make any dangerous advances in this country, seeing that our popular form of government permits the substratum of society to exert its influence through the peaceful and legitimate instrumentality of the ballot box ; but is such complacency well founded ? The spirit of the Commune is opposed to all government ; its aspiration is anarchy. Wait till our population is a little denser and we shall see what kind of a remedy the ballot box is. I fear it will prove a mischievous lever instead of a safety valve. New York City and South Carolina have not afforded a very cheering illustration of the beneficence of Universal Suffrage.

What then is the duty of the Christian citizen in view of this impending evil ?

I think our most obvious duty is to take care that the seditious element of society has no just grounds for complaint. It is useless to deny that it has had grounds for complaint, in the oppressive monopolies of soulless corporations, and in the shameless peculation which has disgraced nearly every office. We must remove these causes of irritation ; but let us not forget the importance of a good example in the work of reformation. Let us avoid all noisy clamor and vulgar exaggeration, and sternly frown down that demagogism which pretends to serve the interests of the public by exciting the passions of the base. These bad men

had their prototype in those chief priests who "persuaded the multitude that they should ask Barabbas and destroy Jesus." With the same righteous scorn ought we to condemn all trifling with our criminal jurisdiction! Let us strengthen the hands of the law with our moral support, and permit no Pilate-like vacillation to make the judicial office popular at the expense of justice; and let us ever be ready, at the peril of life if need be, to aid the authorities in putting down mob violence; however great may be the cause of popular indignation, or however threatening the show of rabble fury. It sometimes requires heroism to perform the part of good citizens.

On the other hand we ought to be free from all arrogance and overbearing manners towards our inferiors. The gentleman should never forget *noblesse oblige*.

Such I conceive is our duty as members of society, but our duty as Christians and Churchmen is to strike at the root of this portentous evil, and remove the motive to sedition. There is but one power in this world to strike that blow effectually and that is the power of Christ's Gospel; Christianity is the sole palladium of civil liberty and social order.

The substratum of society must be elevated; we must have no pariah class; the turbulent masses must be Christianized. We must implant motives and principles in these people to which we can appeal in times of popular excitement. No system of government can otherwise give us security; the ascendancy of no particular party afford us protection. What the people of these United States need above all things is to be made Christians. Nothing else will save us from that tidal wave of anarchy which is already encroaching on the shores of this fair continent.

WALLACE CARNAHAN.

DEAN COLET'S LETTERS *on the Mosaic Account of the Creation, etc., now first published, with a Translation, Introduction, and Notes, by J. H. Lupton, M.A.* LONDON: GEORGE BELL & SONS. 1876. Large 8vo. pp. 320.

Dr. John Colet was born in London, A.D. 1466. His father was a man of wealth and of some note, a knight, and several times Mayor of London. John received an excellent education for the times, and from 1493 to 1497 travelled in France and Italy, having previously received one of the minor orders, which according to the usage of the day enabled him to hold benefices. While abroad he made the friendship of several eminent men, such as Budæus and Erasmus, and acquired a fair knowledge of the Greek language, not then taught in the English schools. On his return home, in 1497, he was ordained Deacon, and in July, 1498, Priest. He retired to Oxford to continue his studies, and while there delivered a free course of lectures on the Epistles of St. Paul, which attracted great notice from their boldness in interpreting scripture. Here also he renewed his acquaintance with Erasmus and a warm friendship sprang up between them, which lasted through their lives.

In May, 1505, Colet was made Dean of St. Paul's, London. He entered upon his duties with great spirit, and made a thorough reform of the establishment: especially by regular preachings himself, and the procuring of lectures by other learned men, on the Bible. In these, many of the evils of the Romish system were boldly attacked, and it is believed that in this way our author played an important part in preparing the minds of clergy and people for that Reformation, which, however, he did not live to see. In these lectures, the evils of the Religious Houses, and of the celibacy of the clergy were so boldly set forth as to excite the anger of the Bishop of London, who accused him of heresy to the metropolitan, Archbishop Warham; but the latter, knowing his worth, refused to listen to the charges. The Dean, however, was made so uncomfortable by the petty persecutions to which, in consequence of his opinions he was subjected, that he resolved to retire into a more private life, and devote his fortune, which was considerable, to some worthy object. He carried this resolve into effect in 1512, by founding and endowing *St. Paul's School*; appointing William Lilly, the well-known grammarian, the first master.

Dr. Colet died in September, 1519, aged 53. His writings were all in Latin, but very few were published during his life time, among these an "Accidence" or Latin Grammar, and certain tracts of "Daily Devotions"

and "Monition to a Godly life." His manuscripts were found after his death in an obscure corner of his study, and were written in such a manner as if intended to be understood only by himself. Erasmus tells us that this arose from a "conscious want of accuracy and correctness of style."

Mr. Lupton, "sub-master of St. Paul's School," the one he founded, has done a good work by rescuing from oblivion some of the principle treatises of Dean Colet, and for the first time printing them in their original Latin, with translations and notes. The present volume is the fifth and last of the series. The other volumes contain: I. "A Treatise on the Sacraments of the Church;" II. "Two Treatises on the Hierarchies of Dionysius;" III. "Lectures on the Epistles to the Romans, delivered at Oxford in 1497;" IV. "An exposition of I. Corinthians." This Fifth and last volume contains, 1. Letters on the Mosaic account of the Creation; 2. On the Composition of Christ's Mystical Body, the Church; 3. An exposition of five chapters of St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans.

When we consider that, as the preface tells us, so high an authority as the author of the "Short History of the English People," says that, "the awakening of a rational Christianity, whether in England, or in the Teutonic world at large, begins with the Florentine studies of John Colet," we must feel the importance of his writings, as aiding to a right understanding of the steps which prepared the way for a Reformation, so different in England from that on the Continent. These books are also interesting as showing the philosophy of the day, in the attempted explanation of the Mosaic Cosmogony, and the "close glossing" then in vogue in Scriptural expositions.

As a specimen of Dr. Colet's style and boldness of speech we quote two passages. Of the Mosaic account of the creation he writes:

It was the design of Moses, (1) to speak worthily of God; (2) to satisfy the minds of ordinary people, in respect of matters known to them; (3) to preserve an order in events; (4) above all to lead the people on to religion, and the worship of one God.

In commenting on Romans v., he gives utterance to this plainness of speech:

How I wish that the Minister of ecclesiastical affairs, and those who call themselves expounders of Pontifical law, would understand that, without the grace of Christ, they in vain administer laws for Christ's people. * * * Atrocious race of men! deadliest plague to the Church of Christ! very devils, transformed into angels of light! in this respect worse than even the devils themselves, and more hurtful to Christian people. * * * O! hardship beyond hardships, when the poor folk that bear the name of Christ, are in worse plight than the Jewish commonality were under the hypocritical Pharisees!

SERMONS PREACHED BEFORE THE UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD and on various occasions by J. B. Mozley, D.D., *Regius Professor of Divinity, Oxford, and Canon of Christ Church.* RIVINGTONS, LONDON; POTTS, YOUNG & CO., NEW YORK. 1876. pp. 345.

Though preached before the University of Oxford, these are not sermons in the ordinary sense, but essays, and very thoughtful and valuable ones. There is very little of technical theology; but a great deal of practical religion. There is a depth and originality about them which is very refreshing in these days of much talking and superficial thinking. They are instructive and suggestive. They are not such as could be profitably read to an ordinary congregation, but the clergy will find in them material which can be made exceedingly useful in selecting topics for sermons. We may instance the two sermons on the Holy Spirit (the 7th and 13th), which are full of matter. We have never seen the relative scope and powers of the Church and State more clearly and satisfactorily set forth than in the first sermon on "The Roman Council." We quote:

The morality, then, of this question is inherent in the very fact that Church and State are two distinct societies; that these societies have two distinct scopes and ends; that with their respective ends what they regard respectively as crimes also differ; and that, therefore, to use the weapons of one of those societies against a sin or error in the other society, is a total irrelevancy and misapplication. The Church is a spiritual society, to educate us by revealed doctrine for an eternal existence: the State is a temporal society, to preserve order and peace in the world, and to maintain human life under its proper visible conditions. If, then, I am guilty of spiritual error, no good conduct in the State gives me any claim on the Church. If, on the other hand, I am respectable in the State, I am not punishable by the State for any spiritual error. * * * To inflict a penalty on them (men), on account of some supposed error in the spiritual society, is as irrelevant, and speaking essentially, as grotesque, as would be the infliction *vice versa* of spiritual censures upon errors of political economy, of invention, of art, or of military strategies. It is only custom which could make people not see that it was as absurd to imprison a heresy as to strike a bad piece of mechanism with an anathema.

The sermon on "Our Duty to Equals," tells some plain truths greatly needed in these days, when some among us seem to be going back to the false idea that the best discipline for the highest religious life is to be found outside of or apart from "the daily round, the common task;" that is to say in some so-called vocation, or mission which involves a seeming humiliation, or descending from our station, or a voluntary sacrificing of position and ease. The author shows, that while such "a condescending life"

as he calls it, has a value and may be for some a clear duty, yet after all the best training of the entire man, the trials which discipline and subdue the tempers and passions, are to be found in "the sphere of equals." We wish we had room for longer quotations; but must content ourselves with the following:

We must accord then the condescending life its own praise, for its own devotion; but we cannot give it the superiority as an engine of discipline and trial for man's pride, for his strong and passionate will, his tendency to idolise himself, his vanity, his jealousy. Equals are more than inferiors the natural correction for self-love.

The same truth is brought out very forcibly, from another standpoint, in the striking sermon on "The Reversal of Human Judgment."

After all, the self-made trial is a poor disciplinarian weapon; there is a subtle masterly irritant and provoking point in the genuine natural trial, and in the natural crossness of events, which the artificial thing cannot manage; we can no more make our trials than we can make our feelings. In this way moderate deprivations are in some cases more difficult to bear than extreme ones. * * * And so it is often the case that what we *must* do as simply right, and, which would not strike even ourselves, and still less anybody else, is just the hardest thing to do. A work of supererogation would be much easier.

We wish we had space for extracts from another forcible sermon on "Nature," showing that "beauty" is as much a revelation and proof of God as is utility, yet at the same time guarding against the idea that "man can get a religion out of the beauty of nature." But we must refrain. We trust what has been given will be sufficient to induce our readers to procure the book itself, they will not regret it.

AUTHORIZED REPORT OF THE PROCEEDINGS OF THE SECOND CHURCH CONGRESS, in the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States, held in the City of Philadelphia, November 9th, 10th, 11th, and 12th, 1875. Edited by the General Secretary. NEW YORK: T. WHITTAKER, No. 2 BIBLE HOUSE. 1876. pp. 255.

The "Church Congress" may be considered a special feature of our time. Those who desire to become acquainted with the opinions of the leading men of our Church, will find them fairly set forth in this "Report" of the last Congress. The thanks of Churchmen are due to the enterprising publisher for furnishing this Report and that of the Bonn Conferences, in so cheap and readable a shape.

THE SCRIPTURAL HARMONY BETWEEN PRIVATE JUDGMENT AND CHURCH AUTHORITY as Chiefly Apparent from the Four Gospels. By the Rev. William Maw Shaw, M. A. LONDON: SIMPKIN, MARSHALL & CO. pp. 271.

The question treated in this work is one of great difficulty, yet also of great importance, especially in these days when we have, on the one hand the theory asserted that there is in religion no such thing as assured truth, but that whatever any man in his private judgment believes to be true, that is for him truth; while on the other side is put forth a claim to absolute infallibility in declaring the truth, to which all reason and conscience of individuals must yield absolute submission.

Our author endeavors to harmonize these extremes, and, upon the whole, satisfactorily and with great good sense, though we think more might be said on behalf of Church authority and tradition than he seems willing to allow, especially in the last chapter "on Tradition."

The writer gives us first a "General Statement of the Question," and in the succeeding chapters cites precedents from the four Evangelists as to, first "Private Judgment" and then "Church Authority," ending with a chapter on "Tradition," in which we cannot but think he is a little inconsistent with himself. His statement of the question may be gathered from the following:

She (the Church) is a *keeper* of holy writ, to preserve it in its integrity; a *witness* as to what is holy writ and what is not; a *teacher* to interpret its truths and to warn against error—but not an infallible guide to challenge the faith and obedience of her people without inquiry.

The true state of the case appears to be this: The only infallible rule of faith is the written Word of God. In the exposition of this rule He is pleased to use Church authority to train private judgment and correct its excesses; and to use private judgment, again, as a check to the undue assumption or domination of Church authority. * * * When we advocate Church authority we do not advocate *unlimited* Church authority; and when we advocate the right of private judgment we do not advocate that right *beyond its limits*.

But can you not lay down some rules to define *the exact province* of these respective agencies? * * * No, we cannot. There lies the difficulty, and a difficulty it is, but a difficulty arising out of the present imperfect or probationary state of man, and even of the Church herself as "militant here in earth." * * * When excesses on the side of Church authority have become from *actual experience* an intolerable burden, they have been corrected, not seldom, even by the very excesses of private judgment themselves, and when, from the *same experience*, the excesses of private judgment have become a pest and nuisance more intolerable than the frogs, and flies and locusts of Egypt, Church authority has stepped in as a wholesome remedy for the

mischief. Christian men have, by a sort of common consent, gladly welcomed the wholesome restraint needed in one case, not less than the happy freedom needed in the other. While every Protestant Church freely admits this principle (that the Church is not infallible) in its *dominion over the individual conscience* in cases not clearly defined by the written Word of God, no Christian body would endure to have its standard of doctrine or its religious usages, or the lawful authority of its ministers, set at nought by the private judgment of its individual members on the plea of superior light and knowledge.

The author solves the question as to the harmonizing of these conflicting authorities by reminding us, a fact too much forgotten, of the promised presence of "Christ, her *living head*," with his Church, who "governs and preserves her by His Holy Spirit evermore."

It is Jesus Christ Himself, who in His kingly headship by these respective agencies purifies and preserves the whole body as occasion requires His correcting or protecting hand.

We have no space for further quotations; we wish we had. We commend the book to those of our readers who have been troubled with doubts on his vexed question. It is a pity that the author is not more careful in his style. We are surprised to find on the pages of such a book these expressions, "of like kidney," "going the whole hog." "The ticket which will carry us through the gate into the city." We protest against the use of such phrases.

THE SABBATH OF THE FIELDS, *being a sequel to "Bible Teachings in Nature."* By the Rev. Hugh Macmillan, LL.D., F. R. S. E. LONDON MACMILLAN & CO. 1876. pp. 358. \$2.00.

The object of this book is to show the relation that exists between religion and science. How, instead of being, as some men now are apt to think, antagonistic, they mutually support and throw light upon each other. It is a true and much needed teaching, and Mr. Macmillan has very clearly and beautifully performed the task he assumed. We have never read a more striking description of the Holy Land than will be found in the first chapter; indeed the book abounds in beautiful descriptions of natural scenery. Our author is a lover, and a scientific student, of nature; he regards it as God's book, and looks beneath the surface for its spiritual teachings. Where all is so good it is difficult to specify, but we call attention to the chapters on "The Prophecies of Ferns," and on "A Pine-Cone," as being very excellent.

THE GREEKS AND THE PERSIANS, *by the Rev. G. W. Cox, M.A.* NEW YORK: SCRIBNER, ARMSTRONG & CO. 1876. pp. 218, 16mo. \$1.00.

This is the first volume of a series of "Epochs of Ancient History," uniform with "Epochs of Modern History" already published. It is to be followed by other works, making ten in all, bringing the history down to the times of the Antonines. This method of teaching history by "Epochs" instead of in one continuous and lengthy narrative, has some great advantages. By selecting certain great events as central points to which the earlier history tends, and around which contemporary history groups its actions, the memory is greatly aided in retaining the facts, and the philosophy of history is made more clear. Thus in the volume before us the central event is the invasion of Greece by Xerxes, one of the most important epochs of ancient history. But before we can enter into this with its eventful consequences, we must know something of the previous history of the contending parties, of the Assyrians and Persians; and of the Greeks with their colonies, and also how the two parties came into conflict. Nor can we understand how it was that Greece, small in extent, poor in resources, and weakened by internal divisions, could withstand the power of Persia, unless we are made acquainted with the character of its people and the peculiar nature of its institutions. Viewed thus, history interests the young, and they are able to see the necessity for, and value of, what otherwise would be to them very dry details of statistics, geography, and philosophy. They see that these explain history, and reading understandingly they find additional interest in the description of the culminating event; and the facts of the Epoch and those leading to them remain impressed vividly and in proper order upon their memories.

This little volume is thus really an epitome of all that is certainly known of the earlier history of the world. It describes, first, the growth of civilization among the Greeks, their settlements and governments; then the Babylonian and Persian empires, and briefly brings the history down to the Death of Darius; more minutely relates the invasion by Xerxes and its defeat, ending with the formation of the Athenian Confederacy, with which a new epoch in Grecian history began. We think the whole series, if the other works are equal to this first, will be very useful and much more likely to be read by the young, than would a continuous history of the same number of volumes.

With so much to praise, we must be allowed two criticisms. We cannot feel reconciled to this new spelling of Greek names; we suppose it is

more correct, but we hardly recognize our old friends Hercules and Croesus under the forms of Herakles and Kroisos, nor do Kypros and Kilikia, seem so familiar to our eyes as they ought. We also feel the want of a map of Greece, or at least of Attica and the surrounding country, and are the more surprised at this omission when so good a map is given of the Greek settlements in Asia Minor. We hope in a second edition this will be supplied.

RUDIMENTS OF THEOLOGY. *A First Book for Students, by John Pilkington Norris, B.D., Canon of Bristol, and Examining Chaplain to the Bishop of Manchester.* RIVINGTONS, LONDON; POTTER, YOUNG & CO., NEW YORK, \$1.25.

Though intended as "A First Book for Students," this work will be found very useful to those who have got beyond the rudiments, or at any rate think they have. It is divided into three parts. I. "Fundamental Doctrines, viz., those which teach of the Trinity, the Atonement, the Church and the Sacraments. II. "Soteriology of the Bible," or a fuller examination, by "what may be called *the method of theological induction*," of the teachings of the Holy Scriptures on the doctrine of the Atonement. III. "Illustrations of Part I. from the Early Fathers." The whole with the "Glossarial Index" forming a very complete treatise on Systematic Divinity. The most valuable portion is that which treats of the Atonement, the author pointing out clearly the errors of the Calvinistic system, and showing, from scripture and the writings of the early Fathers, the true meaning of those much used and little understood words, Atonement, Ransom, Propitiation, Redemption, Justification. In his teachings on the Church and the Sacraments the author follows, and in our opinion wisely, what are generally called Anglican views, as opposed to Calvinism on one side and Romanism on the other; this appears most plainly in the Chapter on the Sacraments, wherein as he tells us in the preface, he relies mainly on the help derived "from Hooker, Bull, Pearson, and (most of all) Waterland." We commend this book very especially to laymen who desire a clearer knowledge of theology; they will find in its chapters on the Atonement, a solution of many difficulties and doubts which the bald teachings, too common among the old Evangelic School, may have raised in their minds. We have to thank the American publishers for a cheap edition of this useful book.

THE PRINCIPAL ECCLESIASTICAL JUDGMENTS DELIVERED IN THE COURT OF ARCHES, 1867 TO 1875. *By the Right Hon. Sir Robert Phillimore, D. C. L. RIVINGTONS, LONDON; POTT, YOUNG & CO, NEW YORK.* 1876. Large 8vo. pp. 420.

This handsome volume contains the opinions and judgments delivered by Sir Robert Phillimore in fifteen cases, embracing those which have attracted so much notice in the Church on matters of ritual, such as the use of incense, of lighted candles on the altar, of vestments, of elevations of paten and cup, etc., although these judgments are not binding upon us of the American Church, yet they are of great value as laying down certain general principles of Church law, and because of the vast amount of information contained in them on the matters under consideration. One is astonished at the immense learning and industry displayed by the Judge. The ancient and modern canon law, the writings of the Fathers and of prominent English, and even in some cases American divines are examined, quoted and commented on at great length whenever bearing upon the case under consideration and general principles of interpretation deduced of great value. For all interested in such questions, whether viewed from a doctrinal or historical point of view, this book will be found a mine of information; and we may add, that, like a mine, it will sometimes require hard digging to extract the valuable matter. The next feeling excited in an American reader will be, of wonder, that from such small causes such great *cases* have arisen. Of course we know that an act or ceremony may convey important teachings and so have a value far above its apparent import. But when, as frequently in these cases, any such teaching is denied, and the act complained of is declared to be simply a symbol of some admitted truth, we cannot but wonder why parties will go to such expense of money and time either to attack or defend such observances; and we congratulate ourselves that with us the freedom from all connection between Church and State, prevents such litigation. We must in candor add, that we think, in most of such cases, "le jeu ne vaut pas la chandelle." Nor can we understand why men should persist in observances which offend, unreasonably if you will, their weaker brethren and drive them from our churches, while they themselves declare that the things are unimportant in their nature. Surely the Church has too many outside enemies to encounter, has too sacred a work to perform, to allow her thus to waste her strength in internal squabbles about candles and vestments.

A MANUAL OF INSTRUCTION IN CHURCH HISTORY. *By the Rev. George W. Shinn, Newton, Mass.* NEW YORK: T. WHITTAKER, 2 BIBLE HOUSE. 1876. pp. 152.

The author says in the preface, very truly, "Church History is a greatly neglected study." "Very little effort is made to instruct our congregations in the origin and development of the Church." One cause of this, he says, "is the lack of *suitable* volumes upon the subject," which is also very true, for numerous as are the Church Histories which have been written, the clergy well know how few there are which the laity can be induced to read. They are either altogether too voluminous, or else such mere epitomes as to be of no interest. The little book before us is intended to a certain extent to supply this want, by giving an outline of "the great landmarks of history," and "tracing the connection between what now is, and what has been." We think upon the whole Mr. Shinn has succeeded remarkably well in his task, considering the size of the book. We are especially pleased with the "Lesson Outlines for Classes" in the appendix. They might be made useful for older classes in schools. Teachers might make these the themes for written or oral instruction, or require more advanced pupils to write compositions on these subjects with great advantage.

As regards this matter of Church Histories, we believe the true plan of writing them for popular use would be one similar to that which Scribner, Armstrong & Co. have so successfully carried out in their little volumes of "Epochs of Modern and Ancient History." Will not some of our Professors of Ecclesiastical History give us a series of volumes of "Epochs of Church History." If well and pleasantly written they would be popular and useful.

REPORT OF THE UNION CONFERENCES, HELD FROM AUGUST 10 TO 16, 1875, AT BONN, *translated from the German by Samuel Buel, D.D. with a preface by Robert J. Nevin, D.D.* T. WHITTAKER, No. 2 BIBLE HOUSE, NEW YORK. 1876. \$1.00

The article by Dr. Perry in this number of the CHURCH REVIEW, on the Bonn Conference of 1875, is a sufficient notice of this valuable book. No one who pretends to take an interest in the religious movements of the day, can afford to be without it. The Preface by Dr. Nevin adds greatly to its value; and the translator has done well his difficult task.

PLATO'S BEST THOUGHTS, *compiled from Professor Jowett's Translation of the Dialogues of Plato by Rev. C. H. A. Bulkley, A. M., Professor in Faith Training College, Boston, Mass.* NEW YORK: SCRIBNER, ARMSTRONG & CO. 1876. pp. 475.

This volume is intended "to present in the most accessible form, the wide range of subjects upon which Plato dwells," for the benefit of those who have not time or inclination to peruse his whole works, and yet desire to "become somewhat acquainted with the best thoughts of the great Greek Philosopher." It consists of extracts of varying length, taken from the translation of Professor Jowett, arranged under appropriate heads, in alphabetical order, with references to the special work from which each is taken.

We cannot say that we are in favor of such books of extracts; they necessarily give but an imperfect idea of an author's teachings; and the reader is entirely dependent on the judiciousness and fairness of the compiler. Still such a book as this has its use, "for cursory perusal and casual quotation," and will enable persons to form a notion of the character of Plato's teachings, who probably would otherwise remain ignorant of it.

SHORT SERMONS ON THE PSALMS, *in their order. Preached in a Village Church, by W. J. Stracey, M.A., Rector of Oxhead. RIVINGTONS, LONDON; POTT, YOUNG & CO., NEW YORK.*

We have received two volumes of these sermons, being on Psalms 1.-LI. To the greater portion of the Psalms one sermon is devoted, but a few furnish texts for three or more. Thus there are three on the 19th Psalm, according to its proper divisions, the first, of God's *works*, the second, of God's *word*, the third, of *prayer and meditation* thereon. In these sermons the Messianic feature of the Psalms is carefully brought out, and a practical application "to ourselves" insisted on. Inasmuch as the Psalms form so important a feature in our Church worship, and yet are so little understood, we welcome every effort to bring before our people their spiritual meaning. These unpretending sermons will furnish pleasant and profitable reading. We must add that the publishers have presented them in a very attractive and convenient form.

JESUS OF NAZARETH: *His Life, for the Young.* By Josaph P. Thompson, D.D. Illustrated. BOSTON: J. R. Osgood & Co. Crown 8vo. pp. 456.

He is a bold man who attempts to popularize the Life of Jesus Christ, and the impossibility of writing down that life, even on its human side has generally been conceded by Christians. Dr. Thompson has essayed a great work in which he has only met with partial success. He has written, not for children, but for youths from twelve to twenty years old, yet his tone greatly varies and his work is vastly unequal. As a setting forth of the contact of Jesus with the life of man, and of the Jewish usages which illustrate the Gospel story, the work has considerable value, and the pictures scattered very freely through the pages are excellent, but as a life of Jesus it is very much what one might expect from a Congregationalist Divine. Dr. Thompson fails to enunciate and bring into bold relief the significant points in our Lord's Life. He fails where Dr. Farrar also fails to some extent. He gives too much the social and personal, too little the religious and divine element in the Life of Christ. He belittles his subject. While the book has much to make it valuable, it is to be criticised adversely chiefly because it leaves out points which a Churchman instinctively looks for, and of which every Christian must feel the want. The publishers have done their duty far better than Dr. Thompson has done his, and some of the fine writing in which he indulges, as on p. 28, might better have been omitted. He took up what other men have not dared to do, and his success is not encouraging.

W.

TWO DISSERTATIONS. I. ON *MONOGENHC ΘEOC*, *In Scripture and Tradition.* II. *On the 'Constantinopolitan' Creed and other Eastern Creeds of the Fourth Century.* By Fenton John Anthony Hort, D.D. CAMBRIDGE AND LONDON: MACMILLAN & CO. 1876.

We can only notice this very learned work; hoping to have in our next number a full and appreciative notice, by one competent to write it.

INTRODUCTION TO THE DEVOUT LIFE, by Saint Francis of Sales, Bishop and Prince of Geneva. RIVINGTONS, LONDON; POTT, YOUNG & CO NEW YORK. 1876.

MEMOIR OF NORMAN MACLEOD, D.D., *Minister of Barony Parish, Glasgow, etc. By his Brother, the Rev. Donald Macleod, B.A. 2 vols. NEW YORK: SCRIBNER, ARMSTRONG & CO. 1876.*

Dr. Macleod, in many respects, reminds us of Sir Walter Scott. There appears to have been the same kindly, genial, quiet Scottish humor, the same love of country, the same appreciations of the beauties of nature, the same loving reverence for the good and true, and the same breadth of views.

Of course in both all this is modified by early training and surrounding circumstances. Yet we cannot help fancying that if Scott had been brought up under the same influences and become a Presbyterian Minister he might have made much such an one as was Macleod.

When he entered upon his first charge at Loudoun in Ayrshire, he found among his parishioners many Radicals, Chartist and Infidels; and he won them over by volunteering to deliver a course of lectures on Geology; and writes of the result :

I think this a practical lesson. Let a minister use every means to come in contact with every class, to win them first on common ground, and from thence endeavor to bring them to holy ground.

While strongly attached to his own Church, remaining firm in his allegiance when the great disruption of the Free Kirk took place, still he seems to have felt the evils of Calvinism in its stricter form, and to have become almost, what would now be called, "broad Church," in many of his views.

Dr. Macleod was twice honored with special commissions by the "General Assembly." In 1845 he was sent to America, to inspect the condition of the Presbyterian Churches, especially in Canada; and in 1867 he visited India to report on the condition of the missionary work there, and his report contains many valuable thoughts. Besides being a zealous parish worker and faithful preacher, Macleod wrote a great deal. He was Editor first of the "Edinburgh Christian Magazine," and afterwards, in 1860, of "Good Words," which position he maintained to the last, advocating therein, in spite of much misunderstanding and even obloquy, a wider and more liberal Christianity than comported with the old Scottish Presbyterianism. Those wishing to obtain an insight into the life of an active Scottish Presbyterian Minister, of loving heart, genial humor, and withal independent spirit, will find this memoir to be of great interest. He died in June 1872, aged sixty.

AUTOBIOGRAPHY OF THOMAS GUTHRIE, D. D., and Memoir. By his Sons, Rev. David K. Guthrie and Charles J. Guthrie, M. A. Two volumes
ROBERT CARTER & BROTHERS. 12mo. pp. 444, 505.

Dr. Guthrie was a man of mark in the Scottish Kirk, and as liberal and true a Presbyterian as we have ever read about. The story of his life, as told by himself and his sons, has interest beyond the circle of his denomination. As a preacher, he has wonderful power; as a Christian worker, his ragged schools showed his interest in the people; as a Church leader, he was almost more influential than any one else in the establishment of the Free Church; as the editor of the *Sunday Magazine*, he accomplished very much for popular religious literature; and as a man of intense feeling and wide sympathies and warm heart he wielded a wonderful influence in Scotland in his prime. The story of his life is instruction for every preacher and abounds in most entertaining anecdotes and illustrations of the art of putting things. It is a biography which one cannot lay down after he has begun it, and which no one can read without personal benefit.

W.

THE HOLY ANGELS. Their Nature and Employments, as recorded in the Word of God. RIVINGTONS, LONDON; POTT, YOUNG & CO., NEW YORK. 1875. pp. 390.

SELECT ORATIONS OF LYSIAS, Edited by James Morris Whiton, Ph. D., author of "First Lessons in Greek," Etc. Etc. BOSTON: GINN BROTHERS, 1875.

HENRI PERREYVE. By A. Gratry. Translated by special permission by the author of "A Dominican Artist," Etc., Etc. (New Edition.) RIVINGTONS, LONDON; POTT, YOUNG & CO., NEW YORK. pp. 233.

THE COMPLETE POETICAL WORKS OF JOHN GREENLEAF WHITTIER, with Numerous Illustrations. BOSTON: JAMES R. OSGOOD & CO. 1876. Paper. pp. 297. \$1.00.

We have received from the publishers this complete and cheap Edition of these well known poems, which places them within the reach of all. Whittier is emphatically an American Poet. It is unnecessary that we should do more than call attention to this "Centennial Edition."

"FAIRLY WITHOUT A RIVAL."—Congregationalist.



THE MOST EMINENT AUTHORS of the day, such as Hon. W. E. Gladstone, Prof. Max Muller, Prof. Huxley, Dr. W. B. Carpenter, Prof. Tyndall, Richard A. Proctor, Edward A. Freeman, Frances Power Cobbe, The Duke of Argyll, James Anthony Froude, Alfred Russell Wallace, Mrs. Muloch, Mrs. Oliphant, Miss Thackeray, Jean Ingelow, Geo. MacDonald, Wm. Black, Anthony Trollope, E. D. Blackmore, Julia Kavanaugh, Mrs. Parr, Henry Kingsley, Mrs. Macquoid, Francis W. Newman, Thomas Carlyle, Erckmann-Chatrian, W. W. Story, Robert Buchanan, Tennyson, Browning, and many others, are represented in the pages of



LITTELL'S LIVING AGE.

IN 1876, THE LIVING AGE enters upon its thirty-third year. Having absorbed its younger competitor, "EVERY SATURDAY," it is now without a rival in its special field. Originally commanded by President Adams, Judge Story, Chancellor Kent, historians Sparks, Prescott, Bancroft, Ticknor, and many others, it has never failed to receive the warmest support of the best men and journals of the country, and has met with constantly increasing success.

A weekly magazine, of sixty-four pages, THE LIVING AGE gives more than **THREE AND A QUARTER THOUSAND** double-column octavo pages of reading-matter yearly, forming four large volumes. It presents in an inexpensive form, considering its great amount of matter, with freshness, owing to its weekly issue, and with a *satisfactory completeness* attempted by no other publication, the best Essays, Reviews, Criticisms, Tales, Sketches of Travel and Discovery, Poetry, Scientific, Biographical, Historical, and Political Information, from the entire body of Foreign Periodical Literature.

During the coming year, the Serial and Short Stories of

THE LEADING FOREIGN AUTHORS will be given, together with an amount, *unapproached by any other periodical in the world*, of the most valuable Literary and Scientific matter of the day from the pens of the above-named and many other foremost Essayists, Scientists, Critics, Discoverers, and Editors, representing every department of Knowledge and Progress.

In short, THE LIVING AGE is invaluable as a time, labor, and money-saving publication. It furnishes the only satisfactorily fresh and **COMPLETE** compilation of a literature that is indispensable to American readers;—indispensable because it embraces the productions of

THE ABLEST LIVING WRITERS in all branches of Literature, Science, Art, and Politics. Attention is invited to the following recent

Opinions of The Living Age.

"Ought to find a place in every American Home."—*New-York Times*.

"In no other single publication can there be found so much of sterling literary excellence."—*New-York Evening Post*.

"Through its pages alone it is possible to be as thoroughly well informed in current literature as by the perusal of a long list of monthlies. . . . It reproduces the best thoughts of the best minds of the civilized world, upon all topics of living interest."—*Philadelphia Inquirer*.

"Simply indispensable to any one who desires to keep abreast of the thought of the age in any department of science or literature."—*Boston Journal*.

"A more attractive periodical cannot be found in the United States. Wherever there is culture and breadth of view it is appreciated, and the more it is appreciated the higher will rise the tone of American literature and the taste of American readers."—*Chicago Tribune*.

"The best of all our eclectic publications."—*The Nation*, N. Y.

"And the cheapest. A monthly that comes every week."—*The Advance*, Chicago.

"Incomparable in the richness, variety, and sterling worth of its articles, and equal to several ordinary magazines in the amount of matter presented."—*The Standard*, Chicago.

"Grows richer and richer the longer it lives. There is no other known way of getting so much good reading for so little money."—*Christian Register*.

"It is a thorough compilation of what is best in the literature of the day, whether relating to history, biography, fiction, poetry, wit, science, politics, theology, criticism, or art."—*Hartford Daily Courant*.

"A pure and perpetual reservoir and fountain of entertainment and instruction."—*Hot. Robert C. Whipple*.

PUBLISHED WEEKLY at \$8.00 a year, *free of postage*. An extra copy sent gratis to any one getting up a club of five new subscribers

"The best periodical in America."—*Rev. Mrs. L. Ongier, D.D.*

"In price, it comes with the choicest literature of the day."—*New-York Tribune*.

"With it alone a reader may fairly keep up with all that is important in the literature, history, politics, and science of the day."—*The Methodist, N. Y.*

"The ablest essays, the most entertaining stories, the finest poetry of the English language are here gathered together."—*Illinois State Journal*.

"More than ever indispensable, in these days of frequent publication in expensive English Reviews, of articles on the great questions of current inquiry, by such men as Max Muller, Huxley, Tyndall, and many others."—*Milwaukee Daily Sentinel*.

"Its publication in monthly numbers gives to it a great advantage over its monthly contemporaries in the spirit and freshness of its contents."—*The Pacific, San Francisco*.

"Of all periodicals in the world, if a man can take only one, he should by all means take THE LIVING AGE. . . . There is nothing comparable to it in true value in the whole range of periodical literature."—*Mobile Daily Register*.

"The more noted new novels appear as serials, and the more distinguished foreign thinkers in criticism, science, and art are represented in its pages. . . . It is the only compilation that presents with a satisfactory completeness, as well as freshness, the best literature of the almost innumerable and really incomparable European quarterlies, monthlies, and weeklies, a literature including the productions of the ablest and most cultured writers living. It is, therefore, indispensable to every one who desires a thorough compendium of all that is admirable and noteworthy in the literary world."—*Boston Post*.

"It has no equal in any country."—*Philadelphia Press*.

CLUB PRICES FOR THE BEST HOME AND FOREIGN LITERATURE.

[* Possessed of "LITTELL'S LIVING AGE" and of one or other of our vivacious American monthlies, a subscriber will find himself in command of the whole situation."—*Philadelphia Evening Bulletin*.]

For \$10.50 THE LIVING AGE and either one of the four-dollar monthly Magazines (or *Harper's Weekly* or *Basar*, or *Appleton's Journal*, weekly) will be sent for a year, with postage prepaid on both; or, for \$2.50, THE LIVING AGE and *Scribner's St. Nicholas*.

ADDRESS

LITTELL & GAY, 17 Bromfield St., Boston.

F. C. HOYT.
(With FOOTE & RICHARDSON, CLOTHIERS,)

Clerical Tailor,

112 & 116 FULTON STREET, NEW YORK,

MADE

Clerical Suits, Cassocks and Cassock Vests.
\$30 Clerical Suits a Specialty.

N. B.—Mr. Hoyt refers to REV. MORGAN DIX, D. D., Trinity Church; REV. GEO. F. SYMEON, D. D., General Theological Seminary, and many others of the Clergy.

CHURCH FURNITURE.



J. & E. LAMB,

59 Carmine Street, New York.

MEMORIAL BRASSES IN GREAT VARIETY.

Workers in Sterling Silver for Church Purposes, exclusively.

Carved Walnut and Oak Eagle Lecterns.

Embroidered Designs in Gold and Colored Silks, IHS, Cross, Crown, XP, Anchor, &c., &c.

Beautiful Silk Banners, \$5 each.

Leather Cloth Banners in Colors and Gold, \$1, \$2, \$3 to \$5. each. Letters &c., in Velvet Papers, 5c and 10c each.

Catalogues Woodwork 10 cts. Metal and Stone 10 cts. Banners and Embroideries 10 cts.

AMERICAN CHURCH REVIEW.

The beginning of a New Year is a good time to subscribe. For this year, articles are in hand or promised by some of our Bishops, and by Prof. Gubernatis, Dr. Lowell, Dr. Dix, Dr. Adams, Dr. Huntington, Dr. Fulton, Rev. Messrs. Anketell, Henry, Newton, Garrison, and many other of our leading clergy.

Those in arrears for subscriptions are earnestly requested to pay at once what is due, to the Proprietor, Newark, N. J. The amount may seem small to each, but in the aggregate is large. If a receipt is demanded, stamp should be enclosed.

RATES OF ADVERTISING.—(One insertion.)

COVER	Outside, 1 Page \$25.	1-2 Page \$15.	1-4 Page \$9.
	Inside, 1 " 25.	1-2 " 12 50.	1-4 " 7.

Inside, 1 Page, \$15. 1-2 Page, \$9. 1-4 Page, \$5. 1-8 Page, \$3.

Liberal deduction made for annual insertions.

Address Rev. E. B. BOGGS, D.D., Proprietor, NEWARK, N. J.